Vol. [illegible],

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

A monthly Magazine to maintain the cause of
TRUTH, FREEDOM, and COMPREHENSIVENESS
in the Anglican Communion.

EDITOR: H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D.

	PAGE
Signs of the Times:—	
Dr. Lang at the Sheffield Church Congress ..	425
Christian Freedom	427
Reformed Services	428
Another View of Prayer Book Revision ..	430
The Appeal to Caesar .. .. The Editor.	432
What is and what might be	436
The Present Value of the Creeds .. .. Hastings Rashdall, D.D., D.Litt., F.B.A.	444
Glimpses of Swedish Church Life .. .. A. R. Watson, M.A.	452
Albert Schweitzer .. .. F. G. Given-Wilson, M.A.	461
A Century of Anglican Theology .. .. .. C. C. J. Webb, M.A., Hon. LL.D.	466
Book Notice—Eschatology arraigned .. .. W. Maurice Pryke.	475
Correspondence—The Bahai	480

OXFORD: BASIL BLACKWELL, 49 BROAD STREET

AGENTS: South Africa—T. Maskew Miller, Cape Town.
Australia—A. McCubbin & Co., 152 Elizabeth Street, Melbourne.
New Zealand—Walter Nash, 110–112 Lambton Quay, Wellington.

Price 1/- net. Annual Subscription, 10/6.

CHURCHMAN

for review should be addressed to:—The Ripon Hall, Oxford.

ould be addressed to:—BASIL BLACKWELL, n, 49 Broad Street, Oxford.

HURCHMEN'S UNION

ANCEMENT OF LIBERAL RELIGIOUS THOUGHT

at the Church House, Westminster, October 31st, 1898.

nt—Professor PERCY GARDNER, Litt.D., LL.D., F.S.A., F.B.A., Oxford.

Vice-Presidents:

PHILIP H. BAGENAL, O.B.E.
Rt. Rev. Bishop A. HAMILTON BAYNES.
F. C. CHANNING, Esq.
The ARCHDEACON OF WESTMINSTER, F.B.A.
The Rev. Canon CREMER, M.A.
The DEAN OF CARLISLE, F.B.A.
The Rev. HUBERT HANDLEY, M.A.
The Rev. GEORGE HENSLOW, M.A.
Sir LAWRENCE JONES, Bart., M.A.
The Rev. Prof. KIRSOPP LAKE, D.D.
The Rev. W. D. MORRISON, LL.D.
The Rev. Canon PAPILLON, M.A.
The DEAN OF PETERBOROUGH.
The Rev. Canon H. P. PLUMPTRE, M.A.
J. ST. LOE STRACHEY, Esq.

Members of the Council, 1921-22.

Chairman—Canon GLAZEBROOK, D.D.

Professor Sir W. ASHLEY, Ph.D.
Mr. P. H. BAGENAL, O.B.E.
Sir JOHN BARRAN, Bart., M.P.
Rev. C. BASS, M.A.
Rev. J. WORSLEY BODEN, M.A.
Rt. Rev. Bishop A. HAMILTON BAYNES.
Prebendary CALDECOTT, D.Litt., D.D.
Rev. A. J. CARLYLE, D.Litt.
Rev. J. R. COHU, M.A.
Hon. GILBERT COLERIDGE.
Rev. C. W. EMMET, B.D.
Rev. ALFRED FAWKES, M.A.
Rev. Canon GAMBLE, B.D.
Rev. F. G. GIVEN-WILSON, M.A.
Rev. J. C. HARDWICK, M.A.
The Very Rev. W. R. INGE, C.V.O., D.D.
The MASTER OF JESUS COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.
Rev. Dr. STEWART MACGOWAN, LL.D.
Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D.
Mrs. MICHELMORE.
Rev. W. D. MORRISON, LL.D.
Mr. CLAUD MULLINS.
Miss NUSSEY.
Rev. C. RAVEN, B.D.
The Very Rev. HASTINGS RASHDALL, D.Litt., [F.B.A.
Rev. G. RENDALL, D.Litt., LL.D.
Mrs. REITH.
Miss MAUDE ROYDEN.
Rev. C. F. RUSSELL, M.A.
Rev. E. ST. G. SCHOMBERG, M.A.
Rev. C. J. SHARP, M.A.
Rev. C. J. SHEBBEARE, B.D.
Rev. H. R. L. SHEPPARD, M.A.
Mr. NOWELL SMITH, M.A.
Canon TOLLINTON, M.A., D.D.
Mr. H. F. WALKER.

Offices—10 CLIFFORD STREET, BOND STREET, W.1.
Hon. Secretary and Treasurer—PHILIP H. BAGENAL, O.B.E.
Assistant Hon. Secretary—Miss DOWELL.
Hon. Auditor—Mr. ROBERT WARNER, F.C.A., 14 Priory Road, Kilburn, N.W.6.
Hon. Librarian—Rev. W. M. PRYKE, B.D., St. Aidan's Vicarage, South Shields.
Hon. Secretary to the Annual Conference—Miss D. NUSSEY, Westfield, Ilkley.
Bankers—LONDON JOINT CITY AND MIDLAND BANK, 129 New Bond Street, W.1.

AIMS OF THE CHURCHMEN'S UNION.

1.—To affirm the continuous and progressive character of the revelation given by the Holy Spirit in the spheres of knowledge and of conduct.
2.—To maintain the right and duty of the Church of England to restate her doctrines from time to time in accordance with this revelation.
3.—To uphold the historic comprehensiveness of the Church of England.
4.—To defend the freedom of responsible students, clerical as well as lay, in their work of criticism and research.
5.—To promote the adaptation of the Church services to the needs and knowledge of the time.
6.—To assert the claim of the laity to a larger share in the government and responsible work of the Church.
7.—To foster co-operation and fellowship between the Church of England and other Christian Churches.
8.—To study the application of Christian principles and ideals to the whole of our social life.

Annual Subscription.—Members, at least 10/-; Associates, 1/-; Life Membership, £10. Cheques should be made payable to the Hon. Secretary of the Churchmen's Union.

All communications as to membership, subscriptions, changes of address, and business matters should be sent to—

The Hon. Secretary, Churchmen's Union, 10 Clifford Street, Bond Street, W.1.

The Modern Churchman is sent free to all full members of the Churchmen's Union.

THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 8. NOVEMBER, 1922. Vol. XII.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

Dr. Lang at the Sheffield Church Congress.

By general consent the Sheffield Church Congress has been the best that has been held for some years. Perhaps the two most significant utterances made at it—one by a member of the Anglo-Catholic party, the other by a member of the Evangelical party—were the Congress Sermon by the Archbishop of York, and the address delivered by the Rev. Dr. Garfield Williams (Education Secretary of the C.M.S.).

The Archbishop's address has been described as 'a trenchant survey of failures,' but it was more than this. It was a call to the Church to evangelize itself. The indictment was contained in a few pungent sentences :

> 'Here we come to the heart of the present problem of religion. Men want a true religion as never before—that is its hope. They do not find it in the Church—that is its trouble. To put it bluntly, religion attracts; the Church repels. Let us face the fact honestly. That it is a fact can anyone doubt who knows what is passing through the minds of the men and women, especially the younger men and women, who eagerly desire a spiritual religion and yet stand apart from the Church. To these the Church is not a witness to the truth of its Gospel, but it is in its divisions, its dullness, its unreality, an obstacle, a stone of stumbling, an offence.'
>
> 'We who are identified with the Church have become so accustomed to its unreality, its dullness, its utter lack of likeness to its ideal, that we tend to acquiesce. We sit at ease in Zion. But to the eyes of men who stand without and watch and yearn for a real religion

these things stand out clear. I have never forgotten the words of an agnostic friend, a true seeker after truth: "I would like to be a Christian, I think I could be, if it were not for the Christians."

'For, always remember, religiousness is not religion. Ecclesiastical business, however absorbing, may be in spirit as secular as any other. Ecclesiastical partisanship, however gilded by spiritual appeals, is in its methods and intrigues as unspiritual and may be more morally corrupting than partisanship in politics.

'The ecclesiastical conscience has throughout history been a chosen home of subtlety and sophistry where the name of God is continually taken in vain. Enthusiastic orthodoxy, in its self-assurance, its bitterness, its unfairness, may be profoundly irreligious. Nay, the emotional excitements of religious worship may have but little spiritual value. It is possible even for those whom we call "the devout" to cultivate assiduously the most holy rites in a spirit and with an effect upon their mind scarcely to be distinguished from the spirit and effects of idolatry. For the danger of idolatry is never far off. It is the age-long and inevitable tendency of human nature when it fails to rise to the worship of God in spirit and in truth.

'The perils of the religious often lie hidden in the heart: but in human history they are writ large. The Master Himself in scathing words foretold them. We cannot, especially at the present time, too often remember that the Scribes and Pharisees were not only the contemporaries and enemies of Christ once. They are His contemporaries and enemies now. They have their seat in ourselves. Now as then religiousness in all its activities and devotions must be tested by the standard of true religion—is it making us love God so that we hold steadfast, prayerful, joyful communion with Him: is it making us love one another so that we live in an ever closer fellowship of service and goodwill to all men?'

The remedy prescribed by the Archbishop was old, but sound.

'It is only because I know my own need that I dare press upon my fellow-Churchmen the present crying need of the Church. It is, quite simply—let me repeat—to evangelise itself. The evangelistic movement which must precede, or at least accompany, all others is a new, widespread, continued effort in every diocese and parish, to recover for ourselves the Eternal Gospel which we are called to preach, to rediscover for ourselves the Christ whom we proclaim. Bishops, clergy, people must set themselves to learn afresh to think Christ's thoughts about God and about man; to accept and follow Christ's transformation of the values of life; to win, through recovered communion with Him, the peace and power of an ever-deepening fellowship with God, and the motive of an ever-widening fellowship with man.'

Although the implications are manifold and the applications are perplexing, yet the situation becomes hopeful when the Church realizes that the most needful of duties is to recover the Christian Spirit.

Christian Freedom.

Dr. Garfield Williams dealt with an aspect of the Christian religion where it and the modern mind can see eye to eye. One indispensable test of the coming of the Kingdom of God, he claimed, is the presence of the spirit of freedom—the freedom of Christ.

> 'I want to suggest to you that in the coming of the Kingdom it is this liberty that we should look for; a liberty *from* certain things that limit human capacity; a liberty *for* certain undertakings that are beyond human capacity and which are, perhaps, even to-day still best described in the language of apocalyptic. For such language seems to have this great advantage that it does not "date," it is "not for his age but for all time," and it is the duty of each successive age to attempt to interpret it in the language of the present and always relate it to its needs.
>
> 'I want to suggest to you that this freedom is threefold. It is a freedom from the tyranny of the past. It is a freedom from the tyranny of the present. It is a freedom from the tyranny of the future.'

There is a reverence due to the past, but it must not be such as to enslave the present; yet in the religious life, more than in any other, it takes this form. Moreover, as Dr. Garfield Williams points out, the attitude of our Lord was one of 'sublime indifference to the teachings of the past about the limits of the possible.' 'Hence

> "the Christian may learn wisdom from the past as to the difficulties to be faced and the sufficiency or otherwise of tested ways of dealing with them, but he must never treat the past as capable of indicating with authority the limits of possible achievement." Now if this attitude to the past is one of the signs of the coming Kingdom, I begin to see the Kingdom coming, and I see the signs of its coming more developed in the East than in the West.'
>
> 'Let me illustrate what I mean. There is not a single one present here who does not believe, at any rate when he gets away from the heat of conflict, that a corporate realisation of the Kingdom in the life of the visible Church is an essential factor in the coming of that Kingdom. Here in this country every denomination is a victim to the tyranny of the past. We seem powerless to cut ourselves free and to regain the liberty which should be the heritage of those who are the subjects of the realm of God. Out there in the East they are beginning to gain this freedom from the tyranny of an ecclesiastical past. It is one of the signs of the Coming of the Kingdom. It would be easy to illustrate this same principle by references to other tyrannies which the past exercises over us in these days. We are in the shackles not only of ecclesiastical but also of theological tradition, and of political, social, industrial and educational tradition. I am not to be understood to say that we are to jettison the traditions

of the past. What I do say is this, that a loyal citizen of the realm of God laughs in the face of the past when it tells him that achievement in any part of the life of the future is conditioned by limits achieved in the past.'

But the speaker felt that fear of the future is as tyrannical as fear of the past, and this fear also Jesus deprecated.

'There is no more authentic note in the teaching of Jesus than this. It does not matter to the citizens of the Kingdom that they "know not what a day may bring forth." They do not have to "take thought for the morrow." It takes thought for itself. Yet fear of the future is the curse of our modern Christianity. Wherever I turn here in the West I come across it. Speaking to one the other day on the subject of freedom for theological speculation I found that his fear was not so much of the present but of what certain views and attitudes would, as he said "*necessarily* lead to in the future." His future was one that left God the Holy Ghost out of account. What did he mean by the word "necessarily"? Something at any rate that was not Christian.'

But Dr. Garfield Williams is primarily concerned with the Foreign Mission field, and it is there that this matter of freedom is of pressing importance. What is our policy to be?

'Are Western Anglicans going to give those new churches that are growing up in Africa and the East a free hand? Or, through fear of the future, are they going to try and stifle their originality? I suppose in the last analysis it does not really very much matter to them, because whatever is said or done, the future is going to be with the Churches whose members have not lost the audacity that is the heritage of the citizens of the Kingdom of God.'

Reformed Services.

The *Second Report of the Prayer Book Revision Committee* appointed by the National Assembly on November 18th, 1920, has just been published.* The Report is worthy of serious attention. It contains much that will be welcomed by Modern Churchmen. It excludes psalms and sections of the psalms unsuitable for recitation at Christian worship: it tends to shorten and simplify the services: it proceeds in many cases by way of permissive alternatives. Hence it is proposed to sanction the concluding of Morning Prayer with the Canticle after the Second Lesson when that service immediately precedes Holy Communion. A short and simple General Confession and General Absolution are permitted as alternatives to those in use

* S.P.C.K., price 1/-.

at present. The Athanasian Creed is permitted as an alternative to the Apostles' Creed on Trinity Sunday. It is also directed that the minister alone may read it to the people, and that it is to be printed in its revised form, which tones down the anathemas. The Proper Preface for Whitsuntide in the Communion Service is amended so as not to assert that the apostles were given the power to speak foreign tongues at Pentecost. Considerable freedom is allowed in the forms of prayer to be used after the Third Collect in the Evening Service, and a second form of late Evening Service is proposed. There is also the opportunity given of abbreviation and variation in the Litany after the Lord's Prayer. Various improvements have been made in the service for the Baptism of Infants, and an alternative service is allowed which has the merit of securing a promise from the sponsors that they will have the child taught to be a Christian. We could wish that the unfamiliar word 'regenerate' had been altogether omitted, and that no reference had been made to original sin, or, as the revisers call it, 'a state of sinfulness.' It is very doubtful whether before St. Augustine, baptism was definitely regarded as removing the guilt of original sin from the infant baptized. Tertullian protested against the early baptism of infants with the words: 'Why does an age which is innocent hasten to the remission of sins?' (*De Baptismo*, 18). And Justin Martyr, in his careful account of the baptism of an adult, refers to the remission of actual sin in baptism, but says nothing at all about the remission of original sin. (*Apol.*, I, 61.)

There is a needful, but somewhat conventional, service composed for the Burial of a Child.

Many additional Collects, Epistles, and Gospels have been provided for much-needed occasions, *e.g.* Harvest Thanksgiving, New Year's Day, a Church Dedication Anniversary, and All Souls' Day. The additional Collects, Epistles and Gospels also include St. Mary Magdalene, the Transfiguration, the Visitation of the B.V.M., the Nativity of the B.V.M. and other pre-Reformation festivals. Some slight alterations are made in the present Epistles and Gospels, but apparently it is proposed to retain the Pseudo-Mark as the Gospel for Ascension Day.

Various alterations are suggested in the Communion Office, which will make it more like that in the First Prayer Book of Edward VI. We could wish that the revisers had generously and wisely recommended the Liturgy of the First Prayer Book of Edward VI as one of the permissive alternatives of the present use. It would have given deep satisfaction to the great majority of Anglo-Catholics, and would not have sacrificed the Reformed character of the Church of England. The reservation of the Sacrament for the Sick is sanctioned. This, we are not surprised to observe, failed to secure the support of the Evangelical Churchmen on the Committee, on the grounds of its probable misuse.

On the whole the changes proposed will commend themselves to modern-minded Churchmen. The Report marks a great advance on anything as yet put forward by so representative a body of High Churchmen and Low Churchmen. Of course, it is not to be regarded as final, but as experimental; this is indicated by the number of permissive alternatives.

Another View of Prayer Book Revision.

A very interesting and able Report on Prayer Book Revision has been put forth by the English Church Union almost simultaneously with the Report of the National Assembly's Committee, which it undertakes both to criticize and to supplement. The E.C.U. Report does not like its rival's proposals, but it feels that what it proposes must under the circumstances be tolerated. It observes, as we think, quite justly that:

> 'Liturgical chaos is an existing fact, which cannot be brought to an end by coercive measures' (p. 3).

It also observes that:

> 'The doctrinal differences which exist within the Church of England make it impossible to substitute by general agreement any other Rite in the place of the Prayer Book as solely obligatory.'

Hence the practical policy advocated is as follows:

> 'There is, therefore, in our opinion, no other course open to "Catholic-minded" members of the Church of England than frankly

* *Prayer Book Revision* (E.C.U. Report), published by the E.C.U., 31 Russell Square, W.C.1, price 1/-.

to resign themselves to an era of liturgical experimentation and "alternative Rites," to endure the resulting confusion and discomfort as best they may, and to concentrate their efforts upon securing permission to build up a really august and majestic English Catholic rite.'

We are not quite sure that the tears are not those of the crocodile; the situation to-day offers greater possibilities to our 'Catholic-minded' brethren than any that has yet befallen them. They propose, and quite rightly, to ask for what they want in the way of Catholic faith and practice, but in no selfish and exclusive spirit. What they want will doubtless alarm many who study this Report, and it deserves study. For ourselves we welcome this new policy on the part of our 'Catholic-minded' brethren. It is a frank and courageous policy, and it is also tolerant. We only hope that they will adhere to it. They state it thus:

'We do not wish to force Catholic ideas or usages upon anyone. Coercion, even if we were in a position to exert it (which we are not), is always and necessarily futile in such matters; we only desire to display the English Catholic idea in its full practical embodiment. We have deliberately refrained from demanding the excision of some alternatives which are uncongenial to ourselves, but are obviously designed to meet the views or susceptibilities of others. We disclaim any wish to compel "Evangelical" or "Central" Churchmen to say or do things which they do not want to say or do; we merely ask for permission to say and do the things which we do desire to say and do. May we not hope that other sections of opinion in the Church will meet us in the like spirit of generosity, confident that Truth is great and must eventually prevail?'

It is not possible within the limits of our space to present even a summary of the E.C.U. proposals. Those who know the Anglo-Catholic party could predict most of them. We, however, regard them as more moderate than might have been anticipated, and certainly as much less Roman than many rites and ceremonies practised at present in not a few of our churches.

We wish in this connection to emphasize here one important point. Where we are to have a policy of alternative and competing rites, we must have a parochial laity who are not only vocal, but also possess some power. At present they have merely the show of power, without the reality.

THE APPEAL TO CAESAR

By the EDITOR.

THE increasing demand for the reform of the English Ecclesiastical Courts, combined with the certainty that the matter must at no distant date come before the National Assembly of the Church of England, has prompted the Council of the Churchmen's Union to issue a Report[1] dealing with these courts. The Report, which is the work of a committee in which the legal and clerical elements were happily blended,[2] deals in a concise and lucid manner with the origin and constitution of our existing ecclesiastical courts, and concludes with a number of observations and recommendations.

The constitution of the highest of these courts, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council as a court of appeal in ecclesiastical causes, is intimately connected with the relation of the Church to the State, and is an integral part of the Church's present system. Since the abolition of the Papal authority in England, the Crown has exercised a control over the Church which admittedly is greater than the control in pre-Reformation times, and is also greater than that which Parliament exercises over the various English Dissenting bodies, whether Protestant or Romanist. Churchmen generally have been content that it should be so, believing that it is an arrangement which has proved beneficial both to the Church and to the State. On the other hand, it must be recognized that the clericalist section of the Church had been becoming more and more favourable to Disestablishment, even if it involves Disendowment. Closely bound up with this growing desire for Disestablishment, in fact based on the same presuppositions, is the clericalist demand for the reform of our ecclesiastical courts. By reform in this connection is meant the abolition of the right of appeal in ecclesias-

[1] *Quis Judicabit?*, published by B. Blackwell, Oxford, price 6*d*., 20 pp.

[2] The Chairman was Dr. Rashdall, and the Hon. Gilbert Coleridge, the Rev. Alfred Fawkes, Mr. Guy Johnson, Mr. Claud Mullins, and Mr. H. F. Walker members.

tical causes to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. The desire of our clericalist reformers is to substitute for it one or more tribunals appointed by the Church. In these tribunals the bishops, or their nominees, would sit as judges, and no appeal would be allowed from their decisions to the Crown.

The strongest objection to this 'reform' is that it would lead to legal decisions in ecclesiastical controversies which would be characterized by partizan ecclesiastical feeling rather than by judicial impartiality. The function of the present court of appeal is, in the final resort, not to formulate the Church's creeds and rubrics, but in cases of dispute to interpret them; an examination of these interpretations indicates that they have been of such a kind as to admit of the Church's progressive adjustment to a changing environment. These decisions, it may be said without exaggeration, have been the product of the ripe wisdom and judicial impartiality of our great lawyers. What is now proposed by the clericalist party is to substitute ecclesiastical judges, who in many cases will be too much involved in the controversial issue to be able to bring to the judgment-seat either the learning, the leisure, or the temperament which are needed to try such very difficult and far-reaching issues.

The clericalist objection to our present system is based on the conviction that the Church ought to have *absolute* control of her officers and members, and that only good Churchmen can be good judges of the interpretation to be put upon Church formularies. Hence the clericalist holds that any ecclesiastical decision which is favoured by the majority of the episcopate is to be accepted, provided that it be in agreement with what is called Catholic doctrine and practice.

The answer to this may be summarized as follows.

First, we do not know, in the light of rigorous research, what is the Catholic doctrine and practice which is to form the judicial standard. Every serious student of history does know, however, that Catholic doctrine and practice have changed and are changing, and he may reasonably suppose that this process is not yet terminated.

Secondly, whilst admitting the value of the episcopate in the practical administration of the Church, we are compelled to

confess that on a number of important occasions the majority of the episcopate have been on the wrong side in ecclesiastical controversy, whether we take the Church as a whole, or particular national or provincial Churches. Infallibility is no more inherent in the episcopate than in the Papacy.

Thirdly, the Church of England cannot profitably be divorced from the English State. Every ecclesiastical corporation in England is in some measure subject to the State: the question of more or less is for Englishmen a matter of expediency rather than of principle. Where the relationship to the State is profitable, by which we mean contributes to the welfare and efficiency of the Church, there it may be accepted gratefully; where it is unprofitable, reform must be secured. But the relationship is like marriage; divorce is disastrous.

Fourthly, the record of ecclesiastical courts is a bad one, whether we recall the Sanhedrin, which condemned our Lord, or those Romanist courts which condemned Cranmer and his fellow-bishops, or those Presbyterian courts which condemned William Robertson Smith and Charles Augustus Briggs. And the reason is not far to seek. It is to be found in the *odium theologicum* and the constitution of the ecclesiastical mind. The writer of the *History of the Great Rebellion*, himself a staunch Churchman, came unwillingly to the conclusion that the clergy as a body have not the judicial mind. In some respects this may be to their credit, because the judicial mind may be cultivated at the expense of other qualities, such as enthusiastic energy, more needful in the Christian minister. But the point is this, we need the judicial mind on the judgment seat. We need judicial decisions which are characterized by wisdom and justice, insight and impartiality; and if we are wise, we shall not allow *a priori* ecclesiastical theories and historical figments to stand between us and our practical needs.

> 'For forms of government let fools contest,
> Whate'er is best administered is best.'

The Jewish Zealots brought about the destruction of Jerusalem, and our ecclesiastical Zealots will do the same by our Zion if we do not exert ourselves. In judging whether our ecclesiastical courts need reform, we must apply not a theoretical, but a practical test.

Judged by this standard, as the Report indicates, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, the final court of appeal in ecclesiastical causes, stands the test, and the clericalist courts do not. It is for this reason that non-clericalist Churchmen are absolutely opposed to the substitution of an episcopal synod or any other type of ecclesiastical court as the final court of appeal in ecclesiastical causes instead of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. As regards the lower ecclesiastical courts, anti-clericalists are willing to make concessions—*de minimis non curat lex*—but not in the case of the highest court. The Report is most emphatic on that point. Its framers conclude thus:

> 'In conclusion we desire to say that in our opinion the members of the Church of England are supremely fortunate in possessing the right of appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. No more capable or distinguished Judges can be found than those who constitute this great Tribunal. It is idle to challenge their competence on the ground either of lack of spiritual capacity or lack of familiarity with the subject matter of ecclesiastical jurisprudence, for the former is, we submit, irrelevant to the decision of legal questions and, as regards the latter, the Court is in no worse position for dealing with ecclesiastical matters than it is in dealing with the manifold and widely differing questions and systems of law which come before it in the ordinary course of its business. It is sufficient that the Court be correctly informed by Assessors upon technical questions.
>
> 'We are strongly and unanimously of opinion that it is a matter of life and death to the cause of liberty and comprehensiveness in the Church of England that this jurisdiction of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council should be retained and that an uncompromising opposition should be offered to the proposals of the two Commissions so far as they affect the constitution and procedure of the Supreme Court of Appeal in ecclesiastical causes.'

At the same time, it should be noted, that the Report strongly supports such reform of the procedure in our ecclesiastical courts as would enable immoral and slothful clergymen to be dealt with in such a way as they cannot be dealt with under the present system. The framers of the Report state that:

> 'Present conditions make it well nigh impossible for a Bishop to take action against an incumbent who is obviously and grossly neglecting the work of his parish, and we should cordially support any reasonable proposals, however, drastic, for simplifying procedure and reducing the costs of proceedings in these Courts, provided always that such changes are not inconsistent with the general principles of English justice.'

WHAT IS AND WHAT MIGHT BE*

ONE of the causes of the shortage of clergy is the fear in the minds of many who consider the possibility of ordination, that the work of the clergy is becoming increasingly insignificant and will not provide sufficient scope for their energies and abilities. My personal belief is that the work of a clergyman is insignificant only where the man is insignificant. The clergyman of a parish has one or two signal advantages. Even where he is busiest, he can to a greater extent, perhaps, than in any other occupation, arrange his own hours and select his own objectives. In this paper I propose to describe some of the ways in which I have tried to make my own work effective. I have myself learnt so much from the experiences of others that I venture to hope that some account of the methods I have tried may be useful to others.

In the first place the clergyman is a teacher. George Herbert in his beautiful book, *The Priest to the Temple*, tells us that 'the pulpit is the parson's joy and throne.' To most of us to preach twice every Sunday to the same congregation is too severe a task to be described as a 'joy,' but it is a great opportunity, and where men consistently try to give their best, they will not even in these days fail to get hearers. There will certainly be no revival of church-going until there is a revival of preaching.

Congregations never weary of hearing the great truths by which men live well handled, if they be presented with freshness and from different standpoints. George Herbert bids us be 'full of all knowledge,' which was certainly easier in his day than it is in ours. But there are great tracts of newly-won knowledge, with which few of our hearers are familiar, though this new knowledge often has a practical bearing on our faith and conduct. Our duty here is, I think, to introduce our hearers to them and present them in a Christian aspect. I find that one of

* This paper, dealing with the work of a single-handed clergyman in a small town of 4,000, was only composed at the urgent request of the Editor, who had reason to believe that the many-sided character of Church activity here described might prove stimulating and suggestive.

the truest ways of preventing shocks to faith is by helping people to grow naturally into fresh truth and to assimilate it.

I see that in the last two or three months the books which have been of special use to me for sermons, have been Crichton Miller's *New Psychology and the Teacher*, McDougall's *Race Degeneration*, J. Arthur Thompson's *The Control of Life*, Schweitzer's *On the Edge of the Primeval Forest*, the *C.M.S. Delegation Report*, Wells' *Oxford and its Colleges*, and Popenoe's *Applied Eugenics*. A good library is essential to the preacher. Few of us can afford to buy books, and of the buying of books there is no end. For my own purposes I find the London Library, in St. James' Square, best. Books are tools, and it is of no use to grudge the postage. If money is a difficulty, it is better to give up smoking than to give up reading.

Again, preaching is not the only way to lead men's thoughts in church. We can do so through our prayers. Since the War no one seems to desire to interfere with our liberty after the third Collect. I claim this liberty frequently. If the Sunday is Hospital or Industrial or Missions Sunday or Harvest Festival, or any other special colour, I have special prayers. If one cannot find appropriate ones, then one must write them, making them as brief, pointed, and musical as possible. Sometimes the sermon suggests special prayers. I have preached on one of Stevenson's favourite lessons and used his prayers, or on Bishop Cosin and used his.

We must try also new ways of reaching men. In Lent on Wednesdays we have a form of service in which there is no preaching, but a theme is worked out with hymns, prayers, Scripture or other readings, vocal solos or choruses. The idea was taken from Canon Barnett's *Worship Hour*. Last Lent our themes were 'The Pilgrim,' 'The Hill Difficulty,' 'The Good Shepherd,' 'The Dark River and the Eternal City.' For 'The Good Shepherd' the readings were a very short but intelligible cutting from Dr. Glover's *The Statue of the Good Shepherd*, and the two obvious passages of Scripture. The order of the service was hymn, Scripture reading, organ solo, vocal solo, prayer, Scripture reading, hymn, organ solo, reading from Dr. Glover, psalm, vocal solo, hymn, blessing. It is very desirable that the conductor should keep the thread of the thought before

the congregation by a sentence or two at appropriate places. The organ solos are used for meditation, and the organist takes his idea from the preceding reading. Our organist, who is blind, has improvised on one or two occasions with extraordinary success. The drawing up of a service of this kind means far more work than a sermon. Suitable prayers must be found or written; suitable readings hunted up; the limited resources of a choir and friends taxed to the utmost; great care taken with the actual reading, then and at all services, for good reading is exegesis. It is hard work, but it is worth doing, especially if the organist, choir master and choir are in sympathy. This year I am trying to work up themes from the *Book of the Revelation*. I may say that the atmosphere of these services has been wholly reverent and devotional, but there are obvious dangers to guard against. They have also brought together far more people than our ordinary Lent services used to draw together.

Secondly, I try to make the church the agent of great living ideals and aims. We talk, for instance, of re-union; let us act it by making personal friends of the ministers: they are generally very friendly people. Never yield to the temptation of proselytizing. That degrades religion. Let us proclaim by our methods that we serve the same Master and recognize our underlying unity. There are in my parish three considerable chapels with Bible Classes, male and female. Each year each one of us holds what is known as a Bible Class Rally. I shall never forget the first occasion on which we held a Bible Class Rally in the parish church. It is the custom for a representative of each Bible Class to give its greeting to the class which is holding its anniversary. So the representatives of the different classes came in turn to the lectern and spoke. Never since the Reformation had the essential religious unity of the parish been so stressed as when representatives of the Nonconformist bodies in turn invoked in the parish church God's blessing on the work of the church. Then followed an admirable address given by Prof. Leonard, well known to members of the Student Christian Movement and himself a Nonconformist, on the use of the Bible for modern men and women.

Once a year we have a united missionary meeting, for which the Nonconformists provide one speaker and we the other. These meetings have been great successes. I have been also

happy enough on one occasion to preside over a joint meeting of Church Council and Free Church Council.

Again, we must not suppose that because we have less power in the school, we cannot be as effective promoters of education. It is still possible for us to teach, and the consequent contact with the children is of extreme value, but we can do far more than that. We can help our school masters and mistresses to increase the possibilities of the school. For this purpose, as opportunity offered, we bought school gardens and then a playing field, so that organised games could be introduced. The effort has been richly rewarded. The whole tone and spirit of the school has altered for the better. The Workers' Educational Association opens a new field of usefulness. Clergy in small parishes may become lecturers; in big ones it is time well spent that is given to helping the W.E.A. The lecturer speaks for an hour, and then follows an hour's discussion. If someone with sufficient knowledge will try to stimulate and guide discussion, it is of untold value to the class, but it means preparation. Then in the summer there are rambles in connection with the W.E.A. to places of interest around, which we see under the conductorship of someone with special qualifications. These are worth trouble in many ways.

Our age, too, is a music-loving age, and music can be another civilizing power. We make our contribution to the musical life of our place, not only by making the choir as good as we can, but by having organ recitals in the church during the winter. Generally these are given by the organists of neighbouring churches or chapels, but once at least in the year we arrange a visit from some well-known organist. Last year we had a delightful recital given by Dr. Henry Ley, of Christ Church. He prefaced each item on the programme with a few words of explanation, indicating also why the particular piece was selected —an excellent plan on an occasion of this sort. This year we are expecting a second visit from Canon Davis, the organist of Wells Cathedral.

Again, it is generally accepted to-day that recreation grounds are essential to the wholesome life of a community, and a special opportunity for service came to me in the bitter need for better provision in our own little town. Nearly all the parish belonged to one landowner, and three years ago the estate came into the

market to be sold in lots. Here was our chance. We formed a Public Utility Company, and bought twenty-two acres of land, of which eight and a half acres form the recreation ground. The recreation ground is let to town football, cricket and tennis clubs. The remainder of our holding consists of a quarry, gardens, and fields. Someday it may be possible, through the possession of the quarry and the fields, to originate a further venture for the good of the community.

There is another special opportunity which may fall more easily to the clergyman than to anyone else, and of which I must say something, because we do not often make so much of it as we might. In many industrial or semi-industrial parishes there is little that is beautiful, and our nature, without the sense of beauty developed, is starved. The beauty of Nature is part of God's revelation of Himself, and an atmosphere of beauty is the natural surrounding of His worship. Our parish churches and churchyards are our opportunity, and through them we may awaken in our people some desire to create what is beautiful. It was some time before we could embark on this. We had a debt on the school to discharge; the organ to renovate and enlarge. We had to purchase the school gardens and playing field and improve the headmaster's house, but we have now made a substantial beginning. Our church has an old and good tower and porch, but the rest, built in 1870, is commonplace, though there is a good modern chancel screen, a Norman font, and two or three good windows. The tower floor was used by ringers and clergy—a very uncomfortable arrangement, and was so dark and damp that the roots of ivy, not then cut, had grown through a four-foot wall. Bit by bit, as we could afford it, we opened a window, put in a floor for the ringers, opened a doorway to it from the tower stair, and have recently finished that section by putting in front of it a beautiful oak screen and gallery. The whole west end of the church is transformed, and has become a joy to us. The clergy vestry is light, dry, and comfortable. The ringers are fully visible to the congregation. This seemed strange to our people at first. Now they realise that it makes them obviously part of those who are helping in the service, and that they hold an honourable position like the choir. The children like to watch the ropes going before service, and there is a consequence which may be reckoned on—a

widespread desire to learn to ring. Last year fourteen came forward to learn, of whom four have become competent ringers. One lad of fifteen has already conducted a peal successfully. I need not say that in designing our changes we sought the advice of a leading church architect, and each piece of work has been made as good as we can make it. By this time next year we hope to erect another oak screen in front of the choir vestry, which will bear on it in ivory letters the names of those connected with the parish who fell in the war. I am now trying to think out a scheme for the walls. As an experiment we are hoping to try the effect of a fresco of Watts' 'Whence, Whither' on a wide space of wall behind the font. If it is unsuccessful, it can be washed out. But church walls are probably treated with less success than any other part of our fabrics, and there is great room for experiment here. Interest in the work of making the church beautiful is certainly spreading in our parish.

If a clergyman has unusual opportunities for using his artistic faculties, he has also scope for employing his antiquarian tastes. The church should enshrine the history of the parish. So far as possible anything that illustrates this should be gathered there—pictures, carved stones, ancient maps, and records. We have not yet much to show, but the little that I have collected seems to create a great deal of interest. When I can get the material I preach a sermon on some phase of parish history. Just here and there registers or country books let a little light into the past, and every gleaning should be saved for future use. I would say, then, make the church the handmaid of good living ideals and aspirations, whether it is for re-union or education, for the provision of good music or wholesome recreation, or for ministering to the sense of beauty.

Thirdly, I endeavour to identify myself with my people. I do not believe that we can ever, without grave loss, dispense with house-to-house visiting. We must get to know people, and we ought to go where people congregate. The Urban District Council or Board of Guardians, the Co-operative Society, the Workers' Educational Association, or the Nursing Association and all similar bodies, bring us into close and useful relations with our fellow-citizens. But there is no better way of getting to know people than working side by side with them if oppor-

tunity offers. During the War in country parishes it was easy to take part in haymaking and harvesting, and some of my most delightful recollections are of long days in a wood in two or three successive Septembers with my cottager-neighbours, gathering great stores of wood and faggots. The autumn tints, the bright sunshine, the meals eaten around a great camp fire, the ring of the hatchet, the jest and laughter and happy voices of the children—none of us who took part will ever forget. We talk of them whenever I re-visit my old parish. In loading up the faggots on the waggon, I realized why Shakespeare said, 'Who would fardels bear?' In common manual work acquaintance leaps into friendship.

In my present parish I have had similar opportunities. I spent three days on Salisbury Plain, helping a party of young fellows to take down a 100 ft. vehicle shed, and pack it in trucks. We then re-erected it, largely by volunteer labour, as a grand stand on our recreation ground. I feared at first that they would find my presence a restraint, but it was not so. They insisted on my accompanying them to a small eating house for my meals, telling me in a somewhat quaint phrase that they liked 'to have the shepherd with the sheep.'

With our C.E.M.S. men I have worked in the churchyard and assisted in walling in, filling in and converting into a playground for the school some swampy land by a stream. There is no better way of getting to know people. We have also instituted a useful custom in our C.E.M.S. of going in a body to hold a service once or twice during the summer in some neighbouring parish. We take our tea with us in W.E.A. style, and eat it usually in the rectory garden. Sometimes we proceed to church in procession. The cross-bearer leads us, and we follow, singing a hymn to whatever music can be produced. Usually we can muster a couple of violins and pehaps a flute. The short service is essentially a laymen's service, two short addresses being given by members of the C.E.M.S. After the service there is usually a short organ recital given by our blind organist. I should say that the Mothers' Union asserted and established their right to join in these expeditions, but they have not yet claimed the right to provide one of the speakers.

There is another aspect of re-union which must not be overlooked, and that is Social Re-union. We have a rectory with

very large rooms, and a large garden. There is a prejudice against large gardens on the score of expense, but it is flower beds that make a garden expensive. Ours is simply grass and trees. There are only four pieces of turf in it, which are kept cut—the tennis court, a dancing patch and a bowling green, which the C.E.M.S. roll for themselves, and a cricket pitch for the choir boys. The rest looks like a bit of a park, and is cut through once only about the end of May or early in June with the scythe, and there is always someone who is glad to do this for the grass. Before special occasions the C.E.M.S. come and help to clear up. In the early days of my incumbency we made large sums of money by socials, and we were for a time the chief amusement caterers of the parish. The organisers were a committee of the C.E.M.S. and M.U. The day of these socials is gone, as there is now so much else going on, but lawn tennis tournaments and matches have taken their place. They bring together people without any distinction of denomination. As one of our local Labour leaders said to me:

> 'A thing like this must do good. Just look at the people you've got here. Why, they would never meet anywhere else.'

In the same way our big rooms enable us to offer hospitality to all kinds of societies for committee meetings, &c., which makes the rectory a real centre for the parish and not merely for the church.

In conclusion, I would say this: that, so far from being narrow and dull, the office of a clergyman may be in an exceptional degree creative, if only he has energy, patience and sympathy, and will use his imagination and be prepared to learn. He can lend himself to and serve nearly every good cause in the place, and is in a position to draw people together as no one else can. Some may feel that I have said little about direct spiritual work, but my purpose has been to tell of ways in which we may go outside the methods which are common to us all. My own belief is that every friendship formed, every interest aroused and attached, opens the hearts of our parishioners to our message, and draws their best life into sympathy with us. Christianity is a spirit, and not simply an organisation. We must be businesslike, no doubt, but our essential objective is the permeation of life with the Spirit of Jesus Christ.

THE PRESENT VALUE OF THE CREEDS*

By the Very Rev. HASTINGS RASHDALL, D.D., D.Litt., F.B.A.,
Dean of Carlisle.

A CREED is an attempt to formulate the most essential elements in the belief of Christians. It may be very simple —simple as the creed of the Eunuch in the *Acts* which, though no part of the genuine text, is doubtless taken from an extremely early Baptismal formula, or it may represent an effort to express in the philosophical language of the times the beliefs about God and about Christ which have resulted from the reflection of the Church upon the tradition handed down to it from the early days of Christianity.

I will not attempt to discuss the necessity or the desirability of creeds in general, though much might be said on that subject. The practical question before us is how far our existing creeds are suitable for use by modern Christians. That objections are felt to the present creeds by a large and increasing number of Churchmen goes without saying. I propose on the present occasion to say something as to the grounds of these objections, and as to the proper way of meeting them.

I am not one of those who are in the habit of clamouring for a new creed. The Convocations have sanctioned the disuse in public worship of the creed which is most obviously unsuitable for that purpose, and which contains in its damnatory clauses the articles which most obviously misrepresent the belief of nearly all modern Christians. Any attempt to go further and abandon either the profession at Baptism of the Apostles' Creed or the use of that and the so-called Nicene or Constantinopolitan Creed in worship would at the present moment simply split up the Church of England into two sections. It would end in fresh schism, when what we want above all things is more unity. But I think it is fair to those who have taken that line to point out that to ask for a new creed does not neces-

*A paper read at the Sheffield Church Congress, on 12th October, 1922.

sarily imply (as has so often been said in strident accents of late) disbelief in the old creeds. Especially is that so when all that is desired is the option of using another creed in some of our services. The Church of Engand has not officially given up belief in the Athanasian Creed because it has already, by the voice of its Convocations, abolished its compulsory use. The C.E.M.S. has not rejected the Apostles' Creed because in the short service which precedes its meetings it has thought it more suitable to use the shorter and simpler summary (taken from the Catechism) of the things which the Creed chiefly teaches us. It is possible for a Churchman to deprecate the use of any existing creed in worship, though he may believe the whole of it, on many grounds—because he desires a wider Church, because he does not think that doubts about some things contained in it preclude religious fellowship with those who believe them, or because it is too long, or too technical, and likely to be misunderstood by uneducated or perhaps by educated modern men. But for myself I recognize that the attempt to get rid of, or even to alter, the two older creeds or to render their use in worship optional, is not a demand which it is wise to press for at the present moment. That does not imply that one is altogether satisfied with the creeds as they stand, or that they are to remain unaltered for ever. And I will at once confess that the objection to the creeds does in part arise from the fact that, understood in their literal sense, they contain things which few modern men really believe, and others about which an increasing number feel more or less doubt and difficulty.

What, then, is it that makes the existing creeds a difficulty to modern minds? Our existing creeds contain two elements. There is an historical element and a metaphysical element. At the present day it is universally recognized that some things may be taken metaphorically. Nobody believes that there is literally any right hand or left hand of God. No modern man believes what the framers of the creeds probably meant by the words, 'He descended into hell'—that is, that He descended into a place below the surface of this planet which you would come to if you were to dig deep enough. Nobody believes what was originally meant by 'He ascended into heaven.' Taken literally, such an assertion implies a geo-centric Universe. It

is reasonable to plead for the permission of a similar latitude in interpreting the clause relating to the Resurrection. It cannot, indeed, fairly be said that much latitude of interpretation is here required for anyone who believes that Jesus as a matter of historical fact appeared to His disciples after His physical death, whatever the nature of that appearance. The creeds do not define the nature or manner of His appearance. They do not decide the point whether the appearance is that of a resuscitated body or of some other kind. The clause which asserts the Virgin Birth of Christ occasions more difficulty. This is indeed the clause which more than any other makes laymen doubt whether they ought to profess themselves members of any Church which requires them to express assent to this clause, and which prevents studious and reflecting men from taking holy orders. Among modern scholars, the great majority would agree with the Bishop of Durham that 'the additions to the original traditions found severally in the first and third Synoptic narratives are historically doubtful.' But nearly all theologians, whether they believe the clause or not, assert strongly that the truth of the Incarnation in no way rests upon the Virgin Birth. All orthodox theology teaches that the Word, which was made flesh, did not begin to be when Jesus was born, but existed from all eternity. In the present state of opinion on the Virgin Birth, it is absolutely vital to the Church's continued hold on the more thoughtful and instructed part of the community, that it shall be generally recognized that a man has a right to say the Apostles' or the Nicene Creed if he believes the spiritual reality which underlies this clause—that is to say, if he believes in the truth that God became incarnate, or made a supreme and unique revelation of Himself, in the historical Jesus. The time may come when a proposal to return to the original Creed of the Nicene Council, which contains nothing about the Virgin Birth, may obtain a hearing. Till then those who do not want the door of the Church to be closed against an increasing number of thoughtful young men must put themselves on the side of liberty in this matter, whatever their personal attitude may be. Happily there are signs that the Bishops, at all events, are prepared to adopt this attitude. I agree with the Bishop of Zanzibar that 'since the consecration of Dr. Henson, the English

bishops must be counted as supporters of the moderate liberal's claim.'[1]

Till lately, controversy tended to centre round the historical clauses of the creed. But of late a tendency has shown itself for both the attack and the defence to transfer themselves to the more metaphysical clauses of the creeds. Sometimes they are attacked frankly on the ground that they are untrue: sometimes on the ground that to most modern men they have become unintelligible and perplexing, that for men of our day they only disguise or misrepresent the truths that they were originally intended to express.

Time will not allow of my attempting an elaborate examination of these clauses. I can only state my own personal conviction of three things:

(1) The language of certain notable clauses in the two longer creeds is thoroughly archaic. The assertions that the Son is of one substance with the Father, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, that there are three Persons in the Holy Trinity and most of what follows in the Athanasian Creed, are quite unintelligible to the great majority of churchgoers, and are, for the most part, misunderstood by those who think they understand them—especially by those who are most clamorous in defending them, and most fierce in condemning those who understand them differently. I doubt if there is one clergyman in twenty who could explain what is meant by the clause, 'Of one substance with the Father,' without becoming either unintelligible or unorthodox, or both.

(2) I believe that these statements—though expressed in the language of obsolete metaphysics—are not unintelligible to students who have had the requisite training in ancient and in modern philosophy. They bear a meaning which is still true and important for the modern world, if only they are translated into the language of the present day.

(3) To say that this modern translation which they demand will mean exactly the same thing as the words did to those who originally penned them, would be to say too much. The modern man—whether ignorant or learned—never can believe as men

[1] *The Christ and His Critics*, p. 169.

believed in the third and fourth centuries—not even the most orthodox. That is so even as regards the simplest and most fundamental doctrines. When Bishop Gore says, 'I believe in God,' he has a very different thought before his mind from that which was present to the mind of a third or fourth century bishop. Altered ideas about the Universe necessarily imply altered ideas about God.

Nevertheless, I think it is possible to show that the meaning which Christian philosophers and philosophical divines of the present day give to the more difficult and technical assertions of the creeds is much nearer what was originally meant by them than the interpretations which most commonly pass for orthodox. I believe it is quite certain that, when Athanasius declared that God the Son was of one substance with the Father, he did not attribute to the pre-existent Son that degree and kind of separation from the Father which popular orthodoxy demands. The popular conception of the Holy Trinity is that there are three distinct minds, selves, centres of consciousness, as distinct from one another as that of any three human beings. Such a notion is quite unorthodox if we take Athanasius as our guide to the meaning of the Nicene Council. For Athanasius the Son or Word or Logos was the Mind or Wisdom of God. Whenever God thinks, it is the Word or Logos which thinks. God has no thoughts except those of His Word. The Word *is* in fact the divine thought—one of three activities eternal and distinguishable in the one Divine Mind. Athanasius makes it quite plain that he thinks of God as One Mind, not (as some even among learned and reputedly orthodox theologians now declare) three minds. That would have seemed to Athanasius just what the Arians affirmed, or something worse. Still more certainly is popular Tritheism excluded by the teaching of St. Augustine and the Schoolmen. And I would remind you that the so-called Athanasian Creed is only a summary of St. Augustine's great work on the Holy Trinity. In that work it is explained that the Word is the thought or intelligence of God: the Holy Spirit is the love of the Father for the Word and for all His creatures. That is the doctrine of St. Augustine, and still more clearly and consistently of his more lucid interpreter, St. Thomas Aquinas. St. Thomas and other Schoolmen tell us that God is Power,

Wisdom and Love or Will—three eternally distinct activities of one and the same Mind. Both St. Augustine and St. Thomas are most emphatic in asserting that God is one mind. To anyone reading these writers with an open eye, it is quite obvious that they use the word Person in quite a different sense from that in which it is used either by the modern philosopher or by the plain man of the present day. In the language of the very orthodox Schoolman, Richard of St. Victor: 'If anyone wishes to understand the name of Person under its common and proper acceptation, in no way let him think that more persons than one can subsist under that acceptation in the unity of substance.' Understood as St. Augustine and St. Thomas understood it, there is nothing in the doctrine of the Holy Trinity which need make a modern Christian hesitate to subscribe even that most technical and difficult of ancient formularies—the so-called Athanasian Creed.

Now, what is the moral of these considerations?

(1) In the first place, when we have a mass of formulae in the Creeds and Articles—some would add to these the decisions of Councils even when these are not contained in the Creeds and Articles of the English Church—so complicated and technical that it is possible to convict of heresy even divines of the highest repute for orthodoxy, it is clear that great liberty must be allowed in interpreting the technical formulae in which the doctrine of the Holy Trinity and of our Lord's Divinity or (if you prefer it) His Deity are defined.

(2) So long as we use these formulae, it is of the utmost importance that they should be explained. We must not let people go about thinking that the Church teaches that Christ had no human soul, or that that human soul pre-existed, or that the popular Tritheistic explanation of the Holy Trinity is orthodox. It is absolutely essential to the future of the Christian religion in the world that its Monotheism should be absolutely beyond dispute. Do you say it is impossible to explain these things in ordinary modern language? If you say so, you are really arguing against the retention of these formulae—at least for purposes of worship. But I see no difficulty in explaining even to children that God is Power, Wisdom, and Love. There is a

clause in the Catechism used by the Roman Church in England which I should like to see transferred to our own. Here it is: 'Is there any likeness to the Blessed Trinity in your soul?' 'There is this likeness to the Blessed Trinity in my soul: that as in God there are three Persons, so in my soul there are three powers.' Three powers, not three minds or three wills. 'What are the three powers of my soul? The three powers of my soul are my memory, my understanding, and my will.' That is St. Augustine's phraseology: I should myself prefer the scholastic formula: Power, Wisdom and Love, or Will. A very different doctrine this from those of some modern theologians.

(3) Though I personally believe that we can rationally explain the formulae which we have to use, it is impossible to deny that there is among the laity especially—particularly among intelligent men who are possible candidates for holy orders—a growing impatience with these formulae which require so much explanation. While for the sake of unity and of preserving continuity in the Church's teaching we may continue to employ them, we have no right to say that these formulae, and only these, must be used by the Church for all time. I do not doubt that the work of the Holy Spirit may be traced in the gradual evolution of Christian doctrine. But the work of the Holy Spirit did not end in the fourth century, or the sixth, or the sixteenth. Quite unquestionably the Church of to-day has come to think very differently from the Church of the early centuries in matters of the highest importance—to have truer and higher and more really Christ-like thoughts of God. We do not now believe in a God who expressly ordered the massacre of the Canaanites, or Who will eternally torment all non-Christians, all Arians, all deniers of the double procession of the Holy Spirit. If the Church may change its real thoughts about God, it may change the formulae in which it expresses them. I agree with Professor Burkitt that, if we were to attempt to construct a new creed at the present moment, we should probably get something much less satisfactory than the creeds we have. The time may come when that will not be the case.

And here let me remark that, though the creeds, when duly translated into terms of modern thought, have their value now, the extreme emphasis which is laid upon them by many at the

present day is highly injurious to practical and spiritual religion. For, after all, the great value of the creeds is that they teach the existence of God and declare that He has revealed Himself—in a way which is supreme, unique, in a sense final—in the life and character and teaching of our Lord Jesus Christ. But it is of no use to know that God is revealed in Christ, unless we know what He is revealed to be. And about that the creeds, taken by themselves, tell us little or nothing. They do not tell us what sort of man Jesus showed himself to be on earth : consequently they do not tell us what is the character of the God Who is revealed in Him. They do not tell us that God is Love. They say nothing about the character of Christ, or what are the fruits of the Spirit's presence in the heart. They do not tell us what sort of life God wishes us to lead. To discover these things you must go not to the creeds, but to the Gospels. Consequently, it is of much more importance that children should be taught to know and understand the Sermon on the Mount, the parable of the Prodigal Son, the parable of the Pharisee and the Publican, than that they should be warned against confounding the Persons or dividing the Substance. The immense emphasis laid upon the creeds in much religious teaching—sometimes to the disparagement of the New Testament—the refusal to explain them in the frank declaration that they are unexplicable, the bitter controversies to which this attitude necessarily gives rise, the ferocity of the denunciations which are showered upon those who are supposed to deny or misinterpret them, often by persons who are themselves palpably heretical in their own ideas on the subject—all this tends to foster that deadliest of all heresies, the belief that it is a sin to think, and that we are to be saved by a blind and unreflecting orthodoxy. These things tend to obscure the heart of the Gospel teaching—the truth that God is revealed in Christ, and revealed to be Love; and that consequently 'he that abideth in love abideth in God, and God abideth in him.'

GLIMPSES OF SWEDISH CHURCH LIFE

By the Rev. A. R. Watson, M.A., Rector of Rousham, Oxon.

At Morning Service (*Sunday, 3rd September*).

PASSING through the Palace Yard, and its groups of blue-clad soldiers, with metal helmets like firemen, we ascended the steep incline to the Storkyrkan, or Great Church, the Parish Church of Stockholm.

Though it was ten minutes to the hour, the nave was already full, and we had to take our place in the north aisle, whose seats faced inwards towards the nave.

The lofty twelfth century red-brick church was full of warm colour, the vaulting was stencilled in red and blue, and the roomy doorless pews of carved wood were enamelled ivory white, and picked out with gold. At the west end rose the gallery with organ and singers; at the east end, at the sanctuary step in the very centre before the altar stood a great seven-branched candlestick of bronze, nearly six hundred years old, some fifteen feet high and branching out six feet on either side.

On either side of the chancel were huge gilded canopies—I suppose of plaster—some thirty feet high, representing an heraldic mantle surmounted by a crown. These marked the royal stalls—and behind on each side was a screen of green marble.

The altar rail was also of green marble, semi-circular, the approach to the altar being round either extremity. In the sanctuary were two magnificent oak chairs, covered with stamped leather, red and gold. The altar had an antipendium of red velvet with the date 1654 and a fair linen cloth edged with hand-made Swedish lace. Seven candles were lighted on the altar, and the triptych was open. At the east end of the north aisle we could see the huge effigy of St. George and the Dragon—won in the Thirty Years' War, all of red and gold.

The service was *Högmässan*, or High Mass, the usual Sunday service, corresponding to our 'ante-communion.' The ser-

vice of *Nattvardsgang*, or the Lord's Supper, is usually held in the evening.

The congregation was representative of all classes—fashionable people, shop-girls, nurses, artisans—men and women in equal numbers. Particularly striking were the old peasant women, their white hair bound with a black kerchief. All as they came in bent in prayer for rather longer than is customary in England.

The bell stopped, and the organist began to improvise on a modal theme—and the Pastor Primarius of Stockholm, Dr. Widner, and the Komminister appeared from the vestry.

They were vested in *Skrudarna*—chasubles of crimson velvet embroidered with gold—worn over albe and amice.

The first hymn was sung to the tune which we know as A.M. 98. The hymns were sung slowly. The choir was led by a conductor who controlled the organist. The liturgy began with the words 'Holy, Holy, Holy is the Lord of Hosts, the whole earth is full of His Glory.' After this was read the Exhortation, Confession, and Absolution. (The Exhortation begins, 'Dearly beloved brothers and sisters in Christ Jesus.' The Confession, 'I confess,' and the Absolution, 'May the Almighty God forgive us all our sins.') After this came the *Kyrie*—followed by the *Gloria in Excelsis*, of which the first part was sung by the priest, 'Glory be to God on high, and peace on earth, goodwill to men,' and the remainder by the congregation.

After a prayer—the Collect—the Epistle for the Day was read, followed by the 'gradual psalm,' during which the priest stood before the altar—and after the Gospel the Creed was sung. Usually the Apostles' Creed is recited, but occasionally it is replaced by the Nicene.

During the following hymn, the clergy went to the vestry and disrobed. The preacher re-appeared in a black silk gown with high collar, and ascended the pulpit. The Komminister took his place among the congregation during the Sermon.

Dr. Widner, who is one of the best-known preachers in Sweden, preached for some forty-five minutes without manuscript. The congregation listened very intently. The subject

of the sermon was taken from the gospel for the day (Trinity XIII), as is the rule in the Swedish Church.

At the end of the sermon the preacher read a prayer, after which the notices, civil and ecclesiastical, were given out from the pulpit. During the next hymn, the clergy vested and returned to the altar—at which were read the Prayer for the Universal Church, the Lord's Prayer (said by the priest alone) and the versicle and response, 'Let us bless the Lord,' 'Thanks be to God,' sung to ancient plainsong. The service here ended with the blessing and three-fold Amen.

During the final hymn the clergy retired. The congregation knelt for an appreciable interval and then filed out in silence, putting their offerings in the coffers near the door.

Most of the people seemed to wear dark clothing. All the singing was in unison throughout, the people sitting for the hymns but standing for the liturgy.

An Ordination (*Friday*, 15*th September*).

To-day there was an Ordination in Upsala Cathedral of more than usual interest. Schoolmaster Christopher Hoas, of Gammal Svensby, in South Russia, was ordained priest for the congregation there.

The Swedish Colony in South Russia was originally settled on the shores of the Baltic. Catherine II, however, transplanted them to the South. They reached their new home after great hardships, and the settlement has lasted to this day. They retain the old Swedish customs and their dialect preserves a number of old-fashioned expressions.

The Archbishop told me that Herr Hoas had several times been menaced by Bolshevists, and only his great force of character had enabled him to come through.

The new priest was a tall fine-looking man, about forty years of age.

The service was held at 6.30 p.m. and lasted about an hour. We began with a hymn during which the clergy went in procession from the vestry to the altar. The candidate came first, robed in albe and amice—then three priests in crimson

and gold chasubles, over albes, followed by four more priests in black silk gowns, and last, the Archbishop of Upsala in cope of cloth of gold and episcopal robes, carrying his pastoral staff. The procession was brought up by four persons—a general, Prince Carl (the king's brother), a pastor who had been forty years in Russia, and a captain, representing the Swedish Red Cross. The clergy stood round the altar rails in a semi-circle, the candidate in the centre. Before him, on the rail, lay a crimson chasuble.

After the invocation and a collect, the Archbishop addressed the candidate at some length, referring to the work in Russia. 'Far away on the Russian steppes,' he began, 'are a handful of Swedes who share our language and religion.' He then spoke of the critical conditions in Russia and concluded with the words of the Psalmist, 'Yea and broughtest us from the deep of the earth again'—'*och föra oss upp igen ur jordens djup.*'

The address over, a notary proclaimed the name of the candidate. The Archbishop then said, 'Ye that are called to the holy office of priesthood, hear the promises of God's word concerning it.'

Each priest in turn, from either side alternately, then read a passage from the Bible concerning the Ministry.

The passages read were:

Matt. xxviii. 18-20.—Baptism.
John xxi. 15-17.—The Pastoral Office.
John xx. 21-23.—Forgiveness of sins.
Matt. x. 32-33.—Confession of Christ before men.
2 *Cor.* v. 17-20.—Ministry of Reconciliation.
Ezek. iii. 17-19.—A watchman unto the house of Israel.
Matt. v. 13-16.—Salt of the Earth.
1 *Tim.* iv. 6, 7, 8.—A good minister.
1 *Tim.* iv. 12-14.—The gift given by laying on of hands of the presbytery.
2 *Tim.* ii. 15-16.—Rightly dividing the word of truth.
2 *Tim.* ii. 22-25.—Apt to teach.

The Archbishop then said:

'The Lord grant you grace to keep these words in your heart. May they be the rule of your life and a reminder of your duty. Preserve your vigilance, maintain your zeal, now and always, in the service of the Chief Shepherd.'

The Candidate, in answer to questions, publicly recited the Apostles' Creed, professed his belief in the Holy Trinity and his assent to the following question:

> 'Will you according to your best understanding and conscience, purely and clearly proclaim God's Word as it is given to us in Holy Scripture, nd as our Church's confessional writings witness thereto?'

The Notary then administered the oath.

The Archbishop then proceeded to the act of ordination.

> 'May the Almighty God direct and help you to keep this vow. And according to the power committed to me in God's stead by His Church, in this behalf, I commit to you herewith the office of priest: in the Name of the Father, and of his Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.'

While the choir sang the *Veni Creator* the Candidate, still kneeling, was vested in the chasuble and presented with his letters of orders, and the Archbishop together with the other priests laid their hands on his head, while the Archbishop recited the Lord's Prayer with special intention.

After this came a prayer, and a short lesson (I *Pet.* 5, 2-4). The Archbishop then put on his mitre and gave the blessing.

The service was exceedingly impressive and indeed affecting. There was a large congregation mainly composed of university students and people of the middle class. The new priest was soon to return to Russia to begin his work.

The Holy Communion (*Sunday, September 17th*).

At 5 p.m. we went to the Cathedral. The service was *Nattvardsgang*, or the Lord's Supper. The great church was in darkness except for the lights in the choir, and at the door of the sacristy, where a lady was taking the names of intending communicants. There were about a hundred present—chiefly elderly people, rather more women than men.

The priest, who wore a black gown and bands as did the assistant priest, entered, carrying the sacred vessels covered with a crimson embroidered pall.

After a hymn came an address lasting fifty minutes, followed by a prayer for the Church Universal—the *Sursum corda*—and

the Words of Institution. Then the Lord's Prayer was said by the priest, this being applied in Sweden with special intention to all sacramental acts, after which all stood for the *Sanctus* and *Benedictus*. The priest then turning towards the people said, 'The peace of God be with you.' The *Agnus Dei* was sung while the priests made their communion—after which the people received. The words of administration were 'The Body of Christ, given for thee,' 'The Blood of Christ, outpoured for thee.' Wafers were used, being administered by means of a spoon, from a silver-gilt pyx, the communicant taking the wafer into his hand. The chalice is not delivered into the hand. The first three railsful were elderly people, but the fourth was composed entirely of boys and young men, about twenty-five in number. Before the last railful returned to their seats, the priest said:

> 'The grace and peace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Amen. Depart in the peace of the Lord.'

After all had returned to their seats the Prayer of Thanksgiving was said and the Versicle and Response. 'Let us bless the Lord,' 'Thanks be to God'—Alleluia, Alleluia, Alleluia.' After this came the Blessing. During the administration a very beautiful hymn by Wallin was sung to a magnificent melody in a minor key.

The Swedish S.P.C.K. (*Wednesday, 6th September*).

On arrival at Jakobsbergsgatan 15 we were received by Fröken E. von Rosen, who showed us round and explained to us most painstakingly the work and objects of the S.K.D. These letters stand for *Svenska Kyrkans Diakonisstyrelse* or Swedish Church Auxiliary.

This organization occupies in Sweden the place of the S.P.C.K. in England.

The Committee of six clergy and six laity is under the presidency of the Archbishop. The staff consists of three secretaries—together with two more for work amongst young people, and a notary, or financial and business secretary.

The departments comprise a publishing section, a bookshop, with educational literature, and ecclesiastical art, sections—

selling the S.K.D. periodicals, a weekly parish magazine, children's papers, and a paper dealing with healing. There is also a lantern-slide library.

In the main the work is educational: members of the university staffs giving courses for teachers in religious knowledge: supplying literature for study circles. There is also a lending library of books on church history—especially for scouts, seamen's institutes, and Sunday School conferences—and a number of books on Christian economics. There are also funds for building loans, and for exhibitions for theological students. The prayer-books and hymn-books used by the Swedish Church are published here.

The S.K.D. works as the auxiliary of the Church, and at the request of the pastor of each parish.

In one of the offices hung a huge wall-map of Sweden showing by pins with different coloured heads in what towns the S.K.D. was at work: whether by supplying literature or by sending lecturers.

The Sigtuna Foundation (*September* 7-14).

Sigtuna is a small town of seven hundred inhabitants, situated on Lake Mälar, once one of the finest towns in Sweden —founded early in the eleventh century by King Olaf Eriksson, but destroyed by the Esthonians in 1187. Formerly the compeer of Wisby in Gottland, the great mart of the Hansa League—now of all its churches only one remains, S. Mary—the rest—S. Pers (S. Peter), S. Lars (S. Laurence) and S. Olaf —are but ruins. But the piety which raised those churches is not yet extinct, and Sigtuna is now the scene of a new venture of faith.

In 1908-9 there was a remarkable movement amongst the Swedish students, of which the watchword might be rendered, 'Sweden for God.'

Of this movement the most important fruit was Sigtuna Stiftelsen, an ideal realised, the creator being Dr. Manfred Björkquist.

The foundation has been endowed by the generosity of wealthy persons. The building must serve a variety of purposes. There is a Folk High School, to which artisans come

for a winter term of five months from November till Spring. They save up out of their own money and pay their own expenses, living in a small quadrangle of bungalows in the grounds. The Dining Hall and Common Room are in the main building.

Besides this there is a co-educational school for boys and girls. The educational work is recognised by the Swedish Board of Education and receives a grant from them. And also there is a Hospice where visitors may stay, when the accommodation is not required for conferences or educational purposes. The plan of the building is a copy of the collegiate type. There is a quadrangle with cloisters with a rose-garden and fountain in the centre. Round this rises on three sides the building: the class-rooms occupying the ground floor, the guest-rooms the second floor, the third floor being set aside for the dining room and sitting rooms of the hospice. There is a well-appointed chapel and a large open space fronting the fourth side of the quadrangle where open-air services are held.

The whole building is crowned by the tower, which is the home of the library. The two topmost storeys rise above the tops of the pine trees which surmount the hill on which it is set, and from the windows there is a wonderful outlook over the town of Sigtuna with the old church towers and Lake Mälar.

The Institute is administered by a resident Warden and a Lady Director. Morning and Evening Prayers are read daily after breakfast and dinner—at which a hymn is sung: Morning Prayer closing always with the 'Our Father,' and Evening Prayer with the 'Come Holy Ghost' and the Blessing.

At the Hospice one meets the professors of the High School and graduates from Upsala University, connected in one way or another with the Foundation. Many young men wear a small silver badge in form of a rose, which I am told marks them as belonging to a society called Friends of the Church, which pledges them to give personal service to the Church.

On the Saturday night two old Upsala men held us spell-bound for a whole evening with their singing, ending with

the famous University songs of Gunnar Wennerberg. These songs are duets, which are acted as well as sung, between the Magister and his friend, describing every aspect of university life at Upsala.

We met at Sigtuna a Swedish lady who has been for nine years a missionary in China. Feeling in China, she said, had been bitter at the time of the Washington Conference, and their lives had been in danger, She was alone; the only other white people had been taken ill and she had to make all arrangements for their removal. Nothing but complete trust and faith had enabled her to stand the strain. To those who had faith God gave the requisite strength and courage and health.

Their missions, she said, were never in debt—the missionaries cut down their requirements to the bare minimum, and by living a day at a time, food, shelter and money were always forthcoming. The English missions were usually in debt. Why did we send missions to places if we were not prepared to support them?

Mixed marriages of white men and native women were responsible for much trouble in the East, though she had known a missionary who married a Chinese lady and had had a perfectly happy marriage.

She was a lady of distinguished appearance, with a very quiet manner. To me she seemed typical of the Swedish Church which attracts to itself all the most wholesome Christianity of the nation. I feel somehow that owing to their simpler circumstances the Swedes have solved the very problems which confront our Church. Their Catholic tradition adds dignity to their public worship, while their liberal-mindedness enables them to retain the loyalty of their educated classes.

ALBERT SCHWEITZER*

By the Rev. F. G. Given-Wilson, M.A., Vicar of Dedham.

SIXTEEN years ago there appeared in Germany a remarkable book from the pen of a young unsalaried lecturer on the New Testament in the Protestant University of Strassburg. The name of the author was Albert Schweitzer. Four years later—in 1910—it was introduced to English readers under the title, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*. The book was a masterly survey of the results of a critical study of the life and teaching of Our Lord, which had occupied the best-equipped intellects of Germany since the last quarter of the eighteenth century down to present times. The work of this young Strassburg lecturer achieved, it is true, a greater success in England than in Germany; but that was not surprising when it was perceived that its tendency was to discredit and disprove the somewhat complacent view of Jesus, which was accepted and taught by Liberal Protestants in Germany. What this school of thought did in effect was to bring Jesus into the nineteenth century as the incarnation of its own ideals of divine righteousness. It wanted to acquit him of that spirit of other-worldliness, which had led man to look on his religion as a foe to the healthy progress of civilization. As an English writer of discernment observed at the time, these Germna Liberals

> 'with eyes thus occupied could only find the German in the Jew; a moralist in a visionary; a professor in a prophet; the nineteenth century in the first; the natural in the supernatural. Christ was the ideal man; the Kingdom of Heaven, the ideal humanity.'[1]

From that point of view Schweitzer's book did a great service to New Testament theology. It was on its constructive side that its weakness became more apparent when scholars had had time to examine the writer's main theory, which was briefly this. Jesus came preaching the good news of the Kingdom of God, and gathered disciples to his side in expectation of its coming in the near future. But time went on, and the

* *On the Edge of the Primeval Forest*, by Prof. Albert Schweitzer. (A. and C. Black, Ltd., London, 1922; price 6/-.)

[1] Tyrrell, *Christianity at the Cross Roads*, p. 42.

promised Kingdom did not come. Then the thought took shape in the mind of Jesus, that only by his passion and death could the way be prepared for the coming of the Kingdom. That was the new conviction which had dawned upon him. He must suffer for others that the Kingdom might come. Dr. Schweitzer based his theory on sayings of Our Lord which are admittedly difficult to understand, and on that account are apt to be ignored or explained away. For it cannot be denied that Jesus did say to his disciples that the Son of Man was expected to come before they had gone over the cities of Israel; that the Son of Man would come in his Kingdom before some that heard him speak should taste death; and that they would see the Son of Man, who came to give his life a ransom for many, coming in the clouds of heaven. But by pressing such sayings as these, without taking sufficiently into account other sayings and parables, which plainly taught the slow growth and gradual expansion of the Kingdom of God in the hearts of men and in the world, one could hardly avoid the conclusion that after all Jesus was not much more than a disillusioned prophet, who gave his life for an expectation which had not been fulfilled as he taught and believed it would be fulfilled.

The book created no little stir; but the more this drastic solution of what is known as the eschatological question in the gospels came to be studied, the more it was felt to be unsatisfactory and untrue. Nevertheless it remains something of an enigma; for after the gospels had been subjected to the closest critical analysis, Schweitzer, in his closing words, seemed to cast a yearning and wistful gaze on that figure which stands unique in history, as the One who alone can offer a completely satisfying ideal to a troubled and perplexed world, as well as draw men unto Him by the power and attraction of His personality.

> 'He comes to us as One unknown, without a name, as of old, by the lake-side. He came to those men who knew Him not. He speaks to us the same word: "Follow thou me!" and sets us to the tasks which He has to fulfil for our time. He commands. And to those who obey Him, whether they be wise or simple, He will reveal Himself in the toils, the conflicts, the sufferings which they shall pass through in His fellowship, and, as an ineffable mystery, they shall learn in their own experience who He is.'

Besides being a learned theologian, Dr. Schweitzer is also a skilled musician. He has made a profound study of Bach,

and written his life, which is recognised as being one of the best critical appreciations that we have of that master of music. Then one heard that this man of learning and culture had abandoned university life, and was walking the hospitals of Paris to qualify for a medical degree, in order that he might take up the work of a medical missionary in Central Africa. Later it was reported that Dr. Schweitzer and his wife had sailed from France for the West Coast of Africa. And now, within the last few months, in a book of extraordinary interest, he has given to the world his experiences and observations as a doctor in Equatorial Africa. His first words are:

> 'I gave up my position of professor in the University of Strassburg, my literary work, and my organ-playing, in order to go as a doctor to Equatorial Africa';

and he proceeds to explain why he was moved to make this great renunciation. He had given up all to follow where Christ was leading him, and he tells the story of how he spent four and a half years working as a doctor in the French Congo, among the native tribes at Lamberene on the Ogowe river. He took with him, the gift of friends, a piano with pedal attachment, built for the tropics, so that he might play his beloved Bach, and keep himself in practise even in Africa. He was in England this year giving organ recitals—he played one evening at Westminster Abbey—to get money in support of his medical work, and has since returned to his lonely station on the Ogowe river, ministering to the poor, the maimed, the stricken, and the diseased. The war, he reminds us, has made drugs and medical appliances very expensive, carriage to his far away post in the heart of Africa is very expensive too, and he is grateful to any who can send him gifts of money in order to help him to carry on his work.

His latest book is certainly one to be read. If it has a fault, it has the very uncommon one of being too short, for it is full of the observations of a shrewd and learned man on a subject where enthusiasm is very apt to outrun judgement. Written in an easy and attractive style, it tells the fascinating story of his life on the edge of the primeval forest, with its dangers, privations, and hardships; the nature of his work, and his dealings with the natives. Scattered throughout its

pages are the comments of a thoughtful and penetrating mind on the work of a Christian missionary among primitive and savage races.

Simply, sincerely, concisely, and above all wisely, he discusses many of the objections urged against Christian missions, and he does it in such a way as to disarm criticism and to win conviction.

Here is the kind of thing we mean. Dr. Schweitzer proposes the problem: Christ taught the brotherhood of man. If we admit that, and we can hardly do otherwise, ought not a white man to treat a black man as his equal, and not as his inferior? Here is his solution of the problem:

> 'I must show him that I can respect the dignity of human personality in every one, and this attitude in me he must be able to see for himself; but the essential thing is that there shall be a real feeling of brotherliness. How far this is to find complete expression in the sayings and doings of daily life must be settled by circumstances. The negro is a child, and with children nothing can be done without the use of authority. We must, therefore, so arrange the circumstances of daily life that my natural authority can find expression. With regard to the negroes, then, I have coined the formula: "I am your brother, it is true, but your elder brother." '[2]

Again, it is often said that Christianity spoils the native—that a Christian native makes a bad servant. Now you cannot teach a native the religion of Christ without at the same time educating him. As a consequence, in the colonies almost all schools are mission schools—the Government establish hardly any, but leave the work to the missions—so that, as Dr. Schweitzer observes:

> 'all the unhealthy phenomena which accompany intellectual emancipation show themselves among the scholars, and are therefore put down as the fault of Christianity.'

The whites forget what they owe to missions, and he recalls how he once heard, when on board the steamer, the manager of a large company abusing Christian missions. But when he asked

> 'Where did the black clerks and the black store employees who work for you get their education? To whom do you owe it that you can find natives here on the Ogowe who can read, write, and handle figures, and who are to a certain extent reliable?'[3]

the manager was silent; he had no reply to make.

[2] pp. 130, 131. [3] pp. 158, 159.

Once more; we sometimes hear it said that it is useless to attempt to teach negroes the Christian religion, because they are not fitted for it, and cannot understand it. This is Dr. Schweitzer's answer. Negroes have, he says,

> 'a great natural capacity for taking in the elements of religion, though the historical element in Christianity lies, naturally, outside their ken. The negro lives with a general view of things which is innocent of history, and he has no means of measuring and appreciating the time-interval between Jesus and ourselves. Similarly, the doctrinal statements which explain how the divine plan of redemption was prepared and effected, are not easily made intelligible to him, even though he has an elementary consciousness of what redemption is. Christianity is for him the light that shines amid the darkness of his fears; it assures him that he is not in the power of nature spirits, of ancestral spirits, of fetishes, and that no human being has any sinister power over another, since the will of God really controls everything that goes on in the world. . . .
>
> 'Thus redemption through Jesus is experienced by him as a two-fold liberation; his view of the world is purged of the previously dominant element of fear, and it becomes ethical instead of unethical. Never have I felt so strongly the victorious power of what is simplest in the teaching of Jesus as when, in the big schoolroom at Lamberene, which serves as a church as well, I have been explaining the Sermon on the Mount, the parables of the Master, and the sayings of St. Paul about the new life in which we live.'[4]

The doctor gives a vivid and moving account of an operation in the heart of Africa. The operation he has had to perform most often is that for strangulated hernia; and death from this cause, he tells us, is quite common among the negroes of Central Africa:

> 'There are few negroes who have not as boys seen some man rolling in the sand of his hut, and howling with agony till death came to release him. So now, the moment a man feels that his rupture is a strangulated one—rupture is far rarer among women—he begs his friends to put him in a canoe and bring him to me.'
>
> 'How can I describe my feelings,' he goes on, 'when a poor fellow is brought to me in this condition? I am the only person within hundreds of miles who can help him. Because I am here and am supplied by my friends with the necessary means, he can be saved, like those who came before him in the same condition, and those who will come after him, while otherwise he would have fallen a victim to the torture. This does not mean merely that I can save his life. We must all die. But that I can save him from days of torture, that is what I feel is my great and ever new privilege. Pain is a more terrible lord of mankind than even death himself.'

When the patient is brought in he is soothed with an opiate, and put to sleep with the promise that when he wakes he will

[4] pp. 154-156.

feel no more pain. For a hospital the doctor has had to make shift with a building which his predecessors had used as a fowl-house. Thither he calls his wife, who administers the anaesthetic; and with Joseph, his black assistant, in a long pair of rubber gloves, he makes ready for the operation.

> 'The operation is finished, and in the hardly lighted dormitory I watch for the sick man's awaking. Scarcely has he recovered consciousness when he stares about him and ejaculates again and again: "I've no more pain! I've no more pain!" . . . His hand feels for mine and will not let it go. Then I begin to tell him and the others who are in the room that it is the Lord Jesus who has told the doctor and his wife to come to the Ogowe, and that white people in Europe give them the money to live here and cure the sick negroes. . . . The African sun is shining through the coffee bushes into the dark shed, but we, black and white, sit side by side and feel that we know by experience the meaning of the words: "And all ye are brethren." Would that my generous friends in Europe could come out here and live through one such hour!'[5]

A CENTURY OF ANGLICAN THEOLOGY

in relation to the general movement of European Thought*

By C. C. J. Webb, M.A., Hon. LL.D., Oriel Professor of the Philosophy of the Christian Religion, Oxford.

I.

'*TIS Sixty Years Since* is the second title of Scott's first novel which gave its name to the famous series which it inaugurated: and the fact encourages us to think that the lapse of sixty years may suffice to invest events with the halo of romance. The same interval as separated the publication of *Waverley* from the Jacobite rising of 1745 separates us to-day from the appearance of *Essays and Reviews*, an event doubtless less rich than the adventure of Prince Charlie in romantic possibilities but one of no little moment in the history of Anglican theology; and one which marked rather the early and tentative stage of a movement whose importance has been growing from that day to this than (like the failure of the young

*Delivered as lectures to Clergy of the Diocese of Oxford, 1921.

[5] pp. 91-93.

Chevalier to make any considerable impression on the people whose rightful sovereign he claimed to be) the last conspicuous sign of life in a movement doomed, after calling forth a wonderful response of devotion and self-sacrifice, to disappear in the course of a century altogether from the world, remaining only in memory 'to point a moral and adorn a tale.'

Perhaps the most interesting of all the *Essays and Reviews* in the famous volume so called to a reader sixty years afterwards is that on the Tendencies of Religious Thought in England from 1688 to 1730 by the famous scholar Mark Pattison, afterwards Rector of Lincoln College in this University. I am not now, however, concerned with the actual contents of the essay so much as with the spirit of dispassionate historical inquiry which Pattison intended to illustrate by his treatment of his chosen subject. He was conscious that this spirit was one which would excite surprise and in some quarters disapproval when exhibited by an ecclesiastical historian. 'We have not yet learnt,' he says, 'in this country to write our ecclesiastical history on any better footing than that of praising up the party, in or out of the Church, to which we happen to belong. Still further,' he continues, 'are we from any attempt to apply the laws of thought and of the succession of opinion to the course of English theology.' The reception of the essay did not disappoint his expectation in this regard. 'This attempt to present the English public with a philosophical monograph on one special phase of religious thought was,' he tells us in his *Memoirs*, 'singularly unsuccessful.' To judge from the reviews it never occurred to any of our public instructors that such a conception was possible. Clerical or Anti-clerical, from the *Westminster Review* to the *Guardian*, they were all busily occupied in finding or making contradictions between the writer's words and the thirty-nine articles. 'The English public could not recognize such a thing as a neutral and philosophical enquiry into the causes of the form of thought existing at any period. Our clergy know only of pamphlets which must be either for or against one of the parties in the Church.' He mentions, however, two eminent men, neither of them, it is true, an Anglican, who had a juster conception of his purpose. One was the distinguished Lutheran divine, Dorner, the

author of the well-known *History of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ*. He, says Pattison, 'accepted the essay for what it was intended to be, a history and not a manifesto, in his history of Protestant theology and made much use and ample acknowledgment of it.' 'Another exception,' I quote the *Memoirs* again, 'to the chorus of blatant and ignorant howling with which my poor writing was received, I will record. Soon after the publication of *Essays and Reviews*, happening to come down from Town in the train with Father—since Cardinal—Newman, whom I had not seen for a long time, I was in terror as to how he would regard me in consequence of what I had written. My fears were quickly relieved. He blamed severely the throwing of such speculations broadcast upon the general public. It was, he said, unsettling their faith without giving them anything else to rest upon. But he had no word of censure for the latitude of theological speculation assumed by the essay, provided it had been addressed *ad clerum*, or put out, not as a public appeal, but as a scholastic dissertation addressed to learned theologians. He assured me that this could be done in the Roman communion and that much greater latitude of speculation on theological topics was allowed in this form in the Catholic Church than in Protestant communities.'

Pattison was never a sympathetic critic of his neighbours; of those among them who were out of time with himself and his aims he was apt to take a jaundiced view. But those of us who were bred in clerical housholds, the heads of which were his contemporaries, can recognize in his strictures a considerable measure of truth. They will recall how even large-minded clergymen of the Church of England would still be apt to speak in tones of apology when commending a Nonconformist and would regard it as something exciting and venturesome to be engaged in co-operation about some matter of public morals with a Roman Catholic priest or a Presbyterian minister. If here in Oxford, at any rate to-day, the frame of mind thus evinced seems to us something remote and unfamiliar, it is to a great degree due to the special advantage which, during the last quarter of a century, we have enjoyed through the intellectual and religious intercourse between men of divers communions which the establishment among us of Mansfield and

Manchester Colleges and of the hostels of the Roman Catholic religious Orders has brought about. I do not suppose, however, that it is a frame of mind so utterly extinct everywhere, but that an attempt such as I am making in these lectures to connect events in the history of modern Anglican theology with the great movements of thought which affect the whole of our civilization may have to some of my hearers some of the interest of novelty and contrast; though I shall in no way claim to have done more than touch very lightly the surface of a subject which would repay a much more thorough examination than I can pretend to have made of it. I shall for my part be quite content if what I say be found suggestive of further thought and inquiry.

We may, I think, begin our study of Anglican theology during the last hundred years by noting two characteristics of Anglican theology as a whole, which have belonged to it during the greater part of the history of the English Church since its separation from the Roman obedience: its isolation and its Platonism. I will first say something about its isolation. This was in the main due to the *via media*, the middle course, which the English Church took at the Reformation: between the course followed by that part of Western Christendom which adhered to the Roman See and the more innovating course followed by the majority of those who rebelled against its authority. But it was intensified after the Civil War. This struggle had put an enmity between the Anglicanism which triumphed at the Restoration of Charles II and the Puritanism over which it triumphed.

The attention of Anglicans, particularly after the Revolution of 1688, came to be concentrated upon controversies purely national, respecting the claims of rival dynasties to the allegiance of Churchmen. The Universities of Oxford and Cambridge were closed to all but signatories of the Thirty-nine Articles, and lost altogether the international character which had belonged to them in the Middle Ages and had not quite disappeared in the interval between the Reformation and the Restoration. Though the bulk of the English clergy and laity unquestionably continued to regard themselves as on the Protestant side in the great controversy of Western Christendom,

the fact that it was the Puritans who had been ejected, rather than the Conformists, who remained within the national Church, that were nearest in their forms of worship and piety to the Protestants of the Continent, probably tended on the whole to emphasize the distinction between these latter and the Anglicans. When, in the nineteenth century, the Tractarian movement spread far and wide, among both the clergy and laity, a new consciousness of unity in the tradition of Catholic order with the Church of this country before the Reformation and also with the communions which, whether in east or west, had preserved the apostolical succession of the ministy and in consequence (according to the Tractarian view) a genuinely valid Eucharist, this new consciousness, while not in reality bringing the Church of England much closer to the Roman Church, which could not be persuaded to acknowledge the validity of Anglican orders or the Anglican Eucharist and would hear of nothing but submission to the authority of the Pope, undoubtedly removed that large section of the Church which adopted to a greater or less extent the Tractarian opinions further than ever from the Protestant Churches at home or abroad, which repudiated the necessity, whether to the commission of their ministers or to the reality of the grace conveyed in their ordinances, of a connexion through a continuous episcopal succession with the ministry of the ancient undivided Church. Thus in fact the Tractarian movement, while widening in certain ways the outlook of Anglican theology, in some important respects even increased the isolation which, owing to its history, had long been characteristic of it. It is, I think, to a considerable extent, still characteristic of it: but there are now certain influences adverse to this isolation acting upon it. After the Civil War, the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, at that time the only schools of higher learning in England, were closed to all but signatories of the Thirty-nine Articles. This was at once a sign and a part cause of the isolation of Anglican theology during the succeeding period. The opening of the ancient Universities in the nineteenth century to the whole nation, irrespective of religious belief, and the establishment of new Universities in which the limitation of membership to Anglicans was from the first unknown, has been

a potent influence in diminishing that isolation. Even when I was an undergraduate in Oxford, between thirty and forty years ago, though the old tests had been for some years abolished, yet this abolition had by no means taken complete effect. The number of Nonconformist students was still small; while Cardinal Manning lived, the residence of Roman Catholics in the University was discouraged and consequently rare. Even when I began to lecture the great majority of one's audience might be assumed, at any rate in many colleges, to be English born, and bred in the Church of England. But now Oxford (and no doubt Cambridge also) is almost as cosmopolitan as in the Middle Ages, and the nations which are represented in our lecture-rooms are far more numerous and represent the inhabitants of a far larger part of the earth's surface than in the Middle Ages. It is nothing uncommon for a lecturer to have a Buddhist or a Hindoo or a Moslem among his audience, not to speak of members of almost any of the great communions into which Christendom is divided. And not only may the Anglican student of theology thus be brought into association as an individual with men belonging to other Churches and creeds and trained in different traditions, but in the great theological colleges of Mansfield and Manchester and in the hostels of the Roman Catholic Religious Orders, the Anglican teachers of theology have colleagues who are not Anglican co-operating with them, and that for the most part in an entirely cordial and sympathetic fashion. The Faculty of Theology itself is now a faculty not only of Anglican theology, but of Christian theology in the widest sense, opening its degrees to all who are qualified by their competent knowledge of Christian theology to receive them: and in the Society of Historical Theology the seniors—in such societies as the Nicene, the Origen, and I daresay several others, the juniors—of the Anglican community discuss theological questions freely and frankly with men who are not of their communion, but are also in many cases candidates for the ministry of some Christian Church and are, at any rate, earnestly interested in the search for religious truth. I have spoken of Oxford, which I know: but at Cambridge, in the other great school of Anglican theology, there are of course analogous conditions, tending to a similar breaking down of the isolation

traditionally characteristic of that theology; not to mention the newer Universities, two at least of which, London and Manchester, possess active Faculties of Theology in which Anglican theologians co-operate with those of other religious bodies in the service of sacred learning and thought.

I have said enough for the present of the first of the two notes which I mentioned as characteristic of Anglican theology as a whole—its isolation. I pass on to the other—its Platonism.

Not long ago a very intelligent young divine from the Swiss University of Geneva came with an introduction to visit me. He was passing through Oxford in the course of his travels and was anxious to form a just impression of the existing condition of English theology, its characteristics, and its tendencies. In conversation with me upon this subject, he observed that it seemed to him that in the utterances of Anglican theologians (and I think he had most prominently in his mind an address he had heard from the present Bishop of Manchester, Dr. William Temple) there was manifest in a marked degree the influence of the philosophy of Plato; and he made the remark, which seemed to me both just and acute, that to this was probably due to a considerable degree the fact which had struck him that English divines (and I do not think he meant here Anglican divines only, but it would be especially true of them) found what he called Nicene language, the language of the Catholic Creeds, more congenial, and used it more familiarly and readily than was the case with the theologians of the Protestant Churches abroad. As I talked with him, it seemed to me that my Swiss visitor had here hit upon a really important truth about the theology of the Church of England; and I recalled how faithful Anglicanism has been throughout its history to that Platonic philosophy which has been called the 'old loving nurse' of Christian theology, and under the guidance of which the terminology was formed wherein the ancient Fathers and Councils of the Christian Church endeavoured to give an intellectual account of their religious experience. I remembered the great school of the Cambridge Platonists in the seventeenth century who rose above the fierce controversies of the time into a clearer atmosphere of rational piety. I remembered how in the eighteenth century, when Priestley, the celebrated chemist

and the pioneer student (though ill-equipped by his scholarship for the task) of the study of the history of dogma, put forward his Unitarianism as a doctrine free from the difficulties of the orthodox confession of the Trinity in Unity, the reply of his Anglican critic, Bishop Horsley, was: 'I beseech you, read the *Parmenides*'—that dialogue in which Plato shows us how difficult it is, when one thinks it out, to conceive of *unity*: how full this conception, with which we certainly cannot dispense, and which is treated sometimes, as by Priestley, as though it were simple and intelligible, is of paradoxes and puzzles. I recalled how the study of Plato's *Republic* in this University, which was to be so characteristic of Oxford philosophical teaching during the last seventy years, is said to have received a new impulse from the lectures upon it of Sewell, the founder of Radley College, who was attracted by the analogy of the Ideal State depicted by Plato with the ideal of the Christian Church as it presented itself to the imagination of the men of the Tractarian movement. I thought again how deeply dyed in Platonism was the thought of such men as the poet Coleridge, Frederick Denison Maurice and Bishop Westcott, who did so much to mould the thought of those Anglicans who stood more or less apart from the Tractarian movement, while at the same time their teaching has been a hardly less powerful leaven, as I remember Bishop Gore pointing out to me years ago, in the later developments of the school—call it Anglo-Catholic or what you will—which looks back to the Oxford movement as its parent, than the teaching of the Tractarians themselves. I reflected lastly how, if one were to think who were the ablest Anglican theologians of to-day, no names would come more readily to mind than those of the present Bishop of Manchester and the present Dean of St. Paul's, both men who would be the first to confess that they were Platonists and that for them Plato —or, in Dr. Inge's case, a disciple of Plato, Plotinus—stood beside the New Testament itself as the inspiration of their thinking on the things of God and of the soul. Certainly my Swiss friend was right. Platonism is a characteristic of Anglican theology, and to the constant influence of Platonism upon it has largely been due its greater faithfulness to the Catholic tradition of theology as compared with the Lutheran and Re-

formed Churches of the continent of Europe. It would perhaps even be true to say that its isolation, the other note of it to which I have called your attention, was itself not altogether independent of its Platonism: for this very reason, that it tended to render it less sympathetic on the one hand with the Aristotelianism which has dominated the scholastic tradition canonized in the schools of the Roman Catholic Church, and on the other with certain tendencies which deeply affected the general trend of Protestant theology—with the tendency in its earlier days to a certain hostility to reason and philosophy as dangerous rivals of grace and revelation—and in modern times with the doubts (associated with the name of Kant) as to the possibility of a genuine *knowledge* of God, of a 'rational theology.'

The Ritschlian school which has been so prominent in German theology and in Protestant theology generally during the last half century has carried on this tradition. Ritschl, the founder of the school, will not allow theology to have anything to do with metaphysics. Professor Herrmann, of Marburg (whose work on *Communion of the Christian with God* has been translated into English and is deservedly esteemed by many), will not admit that there is anything really in common between the revelation of God in the historical Christ which the Christian enjoys and any revelation, if such there be, which is or has been made outside the Christian covenant. From all such extravagances, which tend to cut the Christian religion adrift both from natural religion and from the historical process in which the Law was ordained to lead the Jew and Philosophy the Greek to the school of Christ, Anglican theology has been preserved by its Platonism. A result of the isolation of Anglican theology to which, as I said, this Platonism has itself ministered, has been that the great movements of European thought, while they have undoubtedly affected Anglican theology and been echoed in its history—it could not be so isolated as not to be affected by them and to respond to them—have nevertheless been to a great extent unconsciously echoed here. It is the purpose of the following papers to show in more detail how this has, in certain conspicuous instances, been the course of events.

BOOK NOTICES

ESCHATOLOGY ARRAIGNED.*

The joint authors of *The Lord of Thought* have issued an uncompromising challenge to the critics of the eschatological school. A few years ago the star of Schweitzer was in the ascendant, and many to-day would admit the profound, and in some cases revolutionary influence which Schweitzer's famous book, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus,* exercized upon their view of the Gospels. Schweitzer's radical alternative 'thoroughgoing scepticism or thoroughgoing eschatology' had about it a highwayman-like directness and simplicity, which inclined the more timid of his readers to accept the strange figure of the Apocalyptic Jesus, proclaimed by Schweitzer as alone historical, rather than to rest content with the cold comfort of utter scepticism. The authors of the present work offer us an alternative no less drastic in the choice which it asks of us. Either, they say, accept the Gospels as they stand, and find there a Jesus of so confused and second-rate a mind that he attempted the impossible task of uniting his own essentially original picture of the divine Father with the savage and unlovely figure of contemporary Apocalyptic, or by the application of critical methods to the Gospel text eliminate from the records the eschatological elements in the teaching of Jesus as we now have it. The appeal of the book is for consistency in our thought of God. Christians have too long halted between two opinions. They have striven at the expense of intellectual consistency, and with no small risk of making shipwreck of their faith, to reconcile two fundamentally opposed conceptions of the divine character. The Jew of our Lord's day was severely handicapped in his thinking by the incubus of a supposedly infallible revelation, which made it impossible for him to free himself from the cruder elements of a more primitive belief. The Church, by taking over the Jewish Old Testament, and the Jewish estimate of its infallibility, involved Christians in the same confusion. From this confusion the rise of historical criticism has done much to deliver us. Belief in a progressive revelation enables the Christian of to-day to eliminate from his picture of God the harsher traits derived from the Old Testament conception of Jahweh. We have seized on the central conviction of the New Testament that the character of God is revealed in Jesus, and the phrase, 'God is like Christ,' has for our generation become almost a catchword of Christian thinking. This is all to the good, but our authors write to remind us that real consistency in our thought of God has not yet been attained. Admitting that Jesus *lived* the true view of God, what of his teaching? It is the thesis of the book that that teaching, *taken as a whole*, is self-contradictory. We read the parable of the Prodigal Son, and intuition tells us that there is a true picture of God, satisfying our deepest needs. We listen to the teaching about God as Father, and our hearts tell us that in that teaching is found the essential contribution of Jesus to man's conception of God—a contribution at once so simple and so revolutionary, that its full magnitude has remained undiscovered during twenty centuries of Christian thought.

* *The Lord of Thought*, by Lily Dougall and Cyril W. Emmet, M.A., B.D. Student Christian Movement, 1922. Price 12s. 6d.

But if Jesus taught a God for whom Father is the name least inadequate, then, it is claimed, he cannot at the same time have shared with his contemporaries the apocalyptic outlook, since it is impossible to separate the apocalyptic God from the whole scheme of which He was an integral and essential part. A detailed examination of apocalyptic literature (specimens of which have been preserved for us in the Book of Enoch, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, the Apocalypses of Ezra and Baruch, and in other works of a similar type) reveals a God who had nothing in common with the Father proclaimed by Jesus. It is the aim of the first part of the book (from the pen of Miss Dougall) to establish this contention. The God of Apocalypse is essentially a legalist, exalting a negative innocence in face of an external law as the highest virtue. His portrait is painted in the lurid colours of an earlier age. He cannot escape from the *damnosa hereditas* of his own past. If he is merciful to sinners, it is only the mercy of 'the long chance.' To compassion, sympathy, redemptive love, he is a stranger. To think of this God as the friend of sinners would have been a notion almost grotesque in its palpable absurdity. The best of his servants had outgrown him. Their own 'growing thoughts of God' caused them to chafe at the crude and clumsy methods of this baleful potentate. In the war between God and sinners God was bound to win, inasmuch as the final trump card was in his hand. When the long chance was over, victory would be with God by the unsatisfactory method of wholesale extermination. The mind of God could think no better cure for sin than the destruction of the sinner. Hopelessly incapable of managing his own universe, this celestial chess player would at last sweep his opponent's men off the board, and order the opponent himself away to execution. Indeed, the policy is not unlike that of the Queen in 'Alice in Wonderland' with her parrot-cry 'off with his head!' and there is something almost bordering on the comic in the airy refusal of God to concern Himself with the fate of the majority. But whether pictured as ruthlessly savage or petulantly incompetent, what has this God of Apocalypse in common with the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ?

None the less (and this is the central problem with which the authors are concerned) this fierce, ruthless, implacable God does find a place in the New Testament, and even in the teaching of Jesus, before the application of the critic's scissors to the pages of the Gospels. It is claimed that John the Baptist is essentially one in his outlook with Malachi, as is clear enough from his talk of the axe, the fire and the threshing floor, and that John's whole teaching is coloured by his expectation of the apocalyptic *dénouement* to be engineered by the apocalyptic God. Like the fourth Evangelist, though on different grounds, Miss Dougall is not altogether free from the bias of a 'Baptist polemic,' and in the interests of her own theory is prone to paint her picture of the Baptist in colours unduly sombre, and to under-emphasize those elements in his teaching which are independent of the apocalyptic background against which he stands. None the less it is undoubtedly difficult to think of John as the herald of Jesus, or of Jesus as in any real sense the successor of John. In her desire that Jesus shall be found to be consistent, in her unwillingness to allow confusion in our Lord's mind and outlook, in her eagerness to exalt him as a thinker of transcendent genius, Miss Dougall seeks to eliminate from his recorded teaching all that would identify him with an apocalyptic Messiah, all that would indicate his acceptance of the apocalyptic scheme and of his own central place with in. Whether her hypo-

thesis that eschatology and Jesus are poles apart can or cannot be substantiated, she will not venture to decide. Hence Mr. Emmet must be called in when necessary to supply the critical verification, if this is found to be possible. But before summoning him to her aid, she will adopt the expedient of eliminating provisionally from her picture the unwelcome apocalyptic traits, and following the dictates of intuition, she will attempt to sketch in outline Jesus as she conceives him, the problems by which he was confronted, and the contribution offered by him towards their solution. This attempt is made in the second part of the book.

The message of Jesus, it is argued, was essentially a gospel, a word of joy and power, good tidings about the character and ways of God. The arbitrary distinction of Apocalypse between the righteous few and the unrighteous many is radically unsound, based as it was upon a confusion between legal innocence and fundamental goodness. 'To attempt to please God by only trying not to do wrong is hopeless, for it is only the effort of the soul to save itself, the consequence of which is loss.' Jesus spoke not to the individual only, but to the nation, and so ultimately to the world. Repentance must be national, since, as the Sermon on the Mount clearly indicates, a change of mind on the part of the whole Jewish people was the essential condition of salvation and future usefulness. Without it national downfall was inevitable, and that not because God delights in the infliction of punishment for disobedience, but because in a rationally ordered universe the law of consequence must inevitably take effect. This distinction between punishment and consequence is in fact fundamental to the thought of Jesus, and unless it be clearly made, ideas of a vindictive God are bound to obtrude themselves. But God for Jesus is essentially forgiving. Law indeed has its place in the divine school, but it is not a penal code. God wins in the struggle with sin, not by the sudden destruction of the sinner, not by the external and clumsy method of the *deus ex machina*, but rather by the inner compulsion of an all-patient love. 'Love,' as Miss Dougall finely says, 'is thus kinglier and more majestic than law, for it rules free spirits. It is the only power than can leave men free while yet it controls their actions.'

Schweitzer will have it that the historical Jesus, as distinct from the imaginative creation of Liberal Theology, will be to our time a stranger and an enigma. With this conclusion our authors will have nothing to do. They proclaim Jesus as the Lord of Thought, the Thinker *par excellence*, who discovered God, revealing Him to men in terms of Love, and who by his discovery has exercised upon the highest thought of each succeeding age a formative influence of unparalleled and growing intensity. Jesus, they assert, was no apocalyptic visionary, looking for a catastrophic and magical destruction of the world-order, but rather one who grappled sanely and constructively with the problems of his day, proclaiming to his nation and to the world the essential principles of social and international salvation. Miss Dougall stoutly repels in advance the half-anticipated charge of modernising Jesus, which she feels may be brought against her. But while confident in the correctness of her own thesis, she is willing to employ other methods than those of intuition for its establishment, and so in the third part of the book Mr. Emmet, like a modern Perseus, comes upon the scene to compass the overthrow of the eschatological dragon with the sword of the critic.

Do the conclusions of intuition and the findings of criticism agree? Miss Dougall does not shrink from stating the issue as startlingly as possible. If Jesus believed in the God of Apocalyptic, His thought was

confused and inconsistent. If He accepted for Himself the *rôle* of apocalyptic Son of Man, then the problem of the love and cruelty of God, which vexed the minds of our Lord's contemporaries, becomes for us the problem of the love and cruelty of Jesus Christ. If He looked for an immediate and catastrophic ending of the present world, then his teaching has little or no relevance for the modern man. What is the judgment of the critic upon all this?

Mr. Emmet believes that the critical verification of Miss Dougall's position is both possible and necessary. In order to justify the elimination of inconvenient passages, he points out the several stages through which the Synoptic material has passed before reaching its present form, driving home his argument by reference to alternative versions of sayings belonging to a single occasion. He would allow large scope for the influence of contemporary ideas highly charged with the atmosphere of Apocalyptic. He contends that the number of passages which compel an apocalyptic interpretation is comparatively small, and that with the elimination of these, it is natural to interpret the much larger number of neutral passages as having no reference to apocalyptic ideas. It is the author of our first Gospel who must be held mainly responsible for the presence of such undoubtedly apocalyptic passages as are found in the Synoptic material. He it is who gives to many parables an apocalyptic colouring, adding on occasions a detailed interpretation which would seem to bear but little relation to the original meaning. The method of Matthew becomes clearly evident when His Gospel is compared with that of Luke. The argument that Luke may have toned down the eschatological significance of certain sayings, is met by reference to the undoubted facts that in *Acts* there is apparently no tendency to eliminate or modify passages of apocalyptic colouring. But if this points to the conclusion that where Luke found in his sources eschatological material, he retained it unaltered, then it is at least arguable that he and not Matthew gives the truer version of many sayings which have been misinterpreted by Matthew in an eschatological sense.

With the view that Jesus taught only an *Interimsethik*, Mr. Emmet has little patience. And he asks pertinently enough, why, if Jesus was so far lacking in individuality and clearness of thought, that he took over bag and baggage the world-scheme of Apocalyptic, does forgiveness of enemies (an idea wholly outside the purview of the apocalyptist) occupy so large a place in his authentic teaching? But, it may be said, if Jesus looked for no immediate *dénouement*, if he expected rather the world's improvement than its speedy dissolution, if for him the Kingdom of God was a non-eschatological conception, what are we to make of the assurance to the disciples, starting out on their mission, 'Ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel till the Son of Man be come'—the pivot passage of Schweitzer's whole position, and what of the frequent use in the mouth of Jesus of the apocalyptic title Son of Man? Here, as Mr. Emmet sees clearly enough, it is a case of all or nothing. If the words about the cities of Israel were actually spoken by Jesus, then *cadit quaestio,* the eschatologists have it! If Jesus really accepted the *rôle* of Son of Man as that *rôle* is conceived by the writer of the *Book of Enoch,* then he was content to clothe himself in the vindictive garb of an apocalyptic Messiah, and the contradiction between that portrait and the portrait of the Suffering Servant is fundamental and disastrous. The cities of Israel passage it is argued (a passage peculiar to the first Gospel), should be assigned not to Jesus, but to the community of Palestinian Christians,

drenched as they were in apocalyptic thought, and looking hourly for their Master's visible return. As for Son of Man, Mr. Emmet, following Dalman, will not allow it to have been a current Messianic title. Jesus, he thinks, gave to it a connotation representative (in the manner of *Psalm* viii and *Ezekiel*) rather than eschatological. If the title were avowedly Messianic, then, unless its frequent use by Jesus is unhistorcal, it follows that he must from the outset have openly declared himself to be Messiah, and such supposition makes nonsense of the Synoptic record.

Now while we can agree that unless he were a confused thinker, Jesus cannot have both taught and lived the Fatherhood of God, and at the same time have retained an unshaken belief in the vindictive potentate of Apocalypse; while we can go further and admit that Jesus ought not to be held responsible for the harsher traits in the Church's portrait of the Christ, it is difficult to accept the thesis that he did not look for any catastrophic *dénouement* of the present world-order, nor expect his own 'return' at the approaching end of the age. It is true that if Jesus were consistent, he must have been revolutionary, not only in his attitude towards the Jewish Law (as we know in fact to have been the case) but no less so in his criticism, whether explicit or implied, of the earlier and contemporary pictures of the Jewish God. What, for example, did he make of a God who drowned the world, or ordered the wholsale extermination of the Amalekites? It is true also that many Jewish thinkers rejected the apocalyptic scheme in its entirety, while retaining in their portrait of God the harsh features of the apocalyptic presentation. And if Jesus were great enough to throw over the cruder ideas of God and to stake everything upon the divine Fatherhood, could he not, it may be asked, have done the lesser thing, and have dispensed altogether with the apocalyptic outlook? The answer must be that while such a course cannot be judged to have been impossible, the evidence that Jesus actually took that course is, to say the least, indecisive. Not even the most radical criticism can get rid of the passage (*Mark* xiii, 32), 'But of that day or that hour knoweth no one, not even the angels in heaven, not even the Son, but the Father,' with its explicit confession of ignorance on the part of Jesus. But if that remains, then the total rejection by Jesus of the apocalyptic outlook is hard to maintain. While undoubtedly he expressed ignorance of the hour at which the end would come, the whole implication of the passage is surely this, that he, in common with his contemporaries, expected a *dénouement,* and expected it at a date near, though undefined. But if such were the belief of Jesus, and if it be granted further that *in some sense* at any rate he regarded himself as Messiah, then the problem of his own relation to the final event of the world's history must surely have presented itself to his mind and demanded solution. To suppose otherwise is to adopt the position (rejected by the majority of modern critics) that the whole apocalyptic colouring of Gospels and Epistles alike is the work of the primitive Christian community and is in no way due to the influence of Jesus. At the same time while some will find it difficult to follow our authors in ruling out completely the expectation on the part of Jesus of a catastrophic termination of the present order, and his own visible return, they will not on that account find themselves compelled to accuse him of confused thinking, or to deny the relevance of his teaching to the problems of our own day. Granted that he was consistent in his view of God, and in the estimate of man and life which follows from it: granted further that for him the conception even of an apocalyptic Messiah must have undergone a transformation no less drastic than that which he

effected in the apocalyptic God, then the acceptance by Jesus of the near approach of the end need not disturb us. Here is no plea for an *Interimsethik*. If God be as Jesus conceived Him, the precepts of the Sermon on the Mount have eternal value, and are essentially independent of eschatology. We of to-day reject completely the eschatological framework (the retention of which by the Church has led in the past to so much confused thinking, to so many contradictory beliefs) but we do not therefore deny its presence in the thought and mind of Jesus. If our Lord's thought of God as Father is essentially true, if Jesus was great enough to discard unflinchingly every less worthy conception of the divine character, and if that teaching about God was lived out to the uttermost in a human life, then the central Christian conviction stands: 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father,' and having that, we find in Jesus of Nazareth a sure Guide, whose spiritual and moral ideas are relevant to the problems and perplexities of our modern world.

W. MAURICE PRYKE.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE BAHAI.

To the Editor of the MODERN CHURCHMAN.

SIR,

One has been wont to regard *The Modern Churchman* and the movement it represents, as urging the attributes of fairness and breadth of vision. It is, therefore, distressing and disconcerting to read, by the exponent of Mohammed and his cult at the recent conference, a feeble and inaccurate impression of another movement: the Bahai. Modern Churchmen have been so much misunderstood and maligned themselves that they should be the very last to range in such a fashion.

When Abdul Baha was entombed at Haifa a year ago, thousands of persons of many creeds attended his funeral. His life and work were appreciated in speeches made by Jewish, Moslem and Christian admirers. Sir Herbert Samuel, representing the British Empire, refused a conveyance, as he desired to honour the deceased and his cause by walking in the procession. King George IV, in 1920, knighted Abdul Baha for his sagacity and high character.

Surely it was a serious mistake when a speaker at the conference took trouble to belittle and misinterpret a movement which, for Islam, stands in the position of our Modern Churchmen. Apparently, he, like Professor Browne, accepted statements in letters from an American lady which were lamentably incorrect. No divine claim was made by Abdul Baha. A 'manifestation from God' is a very different proposition. We have many 'saints,' rightly so regarded, in our own calendar. Really authoritative books on the Bahai are available in the British Museum and elsewhere.

The *Daily Chronicle* said of the movement: 'It is truly Catholic. Not a sect itself, it makes appeal to all sects.' The *Daily News*: 'The materialistic re-birth of Japan is scarcely so wonderful a thing as the spiritual re-birth of Persia.' The *Nation* described Bahais as 'The Quakers of Persia.'

Such a movement deserved far less superficial treatment than it received.

ERIC HAMMOND.